

*With
the Author's Compliments*

HOMOEOPATHY UNMASKED.

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

1875-1876

HOMOEOPATHY UNMASKED;

BEING AN

EXPOSURE

OF ITS

PRINCIPAL ABSURDITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS:

WITH AN

ESTIMATE OF ITS RECORDED CURES.

BY

ALEXANDER WOOD, M.D.,

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, EDINBURGH; EMERITUS
RESIDENT OF THE ROYAL MEDICAL SOCIETY; LECTURER ON THE
PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF MEDICINE, ETC. ETC.

I found every where snares that might entrap, and colours that might deceive the simple ;
but nothing that might persuade, and very little that might move an understanding man,
and one that can discern between discourse and sophistry.

Chillingworth.

EDINBURGH:

JOHN MENZIES, 61, PRINCE'S STREET;

D. BOGUE, LONDON ; AND S. J. MACHEN, DUBLIN.

1844.

PRINTED BY W. H. LIZARS, EDINBURGH.

R56168

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE substance of the following pages appeared originally in the "Scottish and North of England Medical Gazette," and is now published in a separate form, at the request of many professional friends. A large amount of matter has been added, and the attempt has been made to alter the review style, as far as this could be done without entirely rewriting the book.

It has, at the same time, been thought right, to retain the strong expressions made use of in reference to the gross indelicacy of many of their publications; and a mere casual inspection of the Works referred to, will be sufficient to convince any one, that their character has not been misrepresented. If any of the strictures appear to be at all softened down, the author begs to express his willingness to meet the Homoeopathists on the original statements of the Review, should they prefer these to the same truths in their present form.

The Work of Dr. Black is more frequently referred to than that of any other Homoeopathic Author, simply because it was supposed that it was more likely to be in the hands of our readers. It must not, however, be imagined, that the following pages are merely a refutation of this Work; consisting, as it does, in most parts, of a translation of Hahnemann's, it afforded a ready means of explaining his views; and, we are not aware, that we have controverted a single doctrine, which has merely the authority of Dr. Black to recommend it. Our remarks apply equally to the doctrines of Homoeopathy, whether found in the Original of Hahnemann, the Translation of Jourdan, or that of Black. It is the system of the sect, not that of the individual, which we seek to oppose.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
INTRODUCTION	7

CHAPTER I.

Summary of Hahnemann's History—His attempt to obtain a Universal Law and Fixed Principles in Medicine—Impossibility of this, and its Causes—Consequences of the Attempt—Character of the Arguments in favour of Homocopathy—Work of Dr. Black—Hahnemann unable to practise conscientiously without a Universal Law— <i>Is</i> the Homoeopathic Law Universal—It is not, and why	13
---	----

CHAPTER II.

All Truth rests on Evidence—Varieties of Evidence, and their Results—Intuition and Demonstration—Observation—Such Truths the Foundations of Science—Testimony, its Value—The alleged Facts of Homoeopathy not necessary Truths—It claims to be an Inductive Science—What that demands—Well ascertained Facts—Examination of the Homoeopathic Facts—Homoeopathic Experiments not entitled to credit, and why	35
---	----

CHAPTER III.

Even were the Homoeopathic Facts admitted, the Law is not Proved—Homoeopaths do not Practice by their own Law, but change from Homocopathy to Allopathy as suits	
--	--

their purpose—They have mistaken Apparent for Real Analogies, and founded their whole System on these—They do not treat Disease but its Symptoms, mistaking the shadow for the substance—They regard Disease as Cured when the Symptoms have temporarily disappeared, and, in consequence, often find Patients, whom they have regarded as Cured, return with an aggravation of their Symptoms 64

CHAPTER IV.

The Homoeopathic Materia Medica exhibits all the imperfections charged against the Allopathic, with some additional Absurdities—System of Infinitesimal Doses—Patients killed by Homoeopathic Practice, until inappreciable doses were resorted to—Absurdity and contradiction of the Infinitesimal Dose System 90

CHAPTER V.

Homoeopathy considered as an Art—Its claim for belief must rest on the authority of the Testifier—The Homoeopathic Witnesses are deficient in all the Qualities necessary in Witnesses—They are deficient in, First, Sufficient knowledge of the fact attested—Second, Disinterestedness—Third, Integrity—Fourth, Veracity 111

APPENDIX.

App. A.—Additional Illustrations of the Symptoms said to be produced on Homoeopaths by certain Substances . 147
App. B.—Case where the Homoeopaths failed to remove the disease from directing their attention only to the Symptoms 153
App. C.—Modifications produced by Medicinal Combinations—
—I. To promote the action of the basis or principal medicine—II. To correct the operation of the basis, by obviating any unpleasant effects it might be likely to occasion, and which would pervert its intended action, and defeat the objects of its exhibition—III. To obtain the joint

	Page.
operation of two or more medicines—IV. To obtain a new and active remedy not afforded by any single substance—	
V. To afford an eligible form	155-157
App. D.—Cases exhibiting the Effect of Homoeopathic Treatment—I. Case of Pneumonia, complicating Scarlet Fever, ending in Death—II. Case of Fever with Bronchitis—	
Death of one Child, under Homoeopathy, Recovery of the other by Ordinary Treatment—III. Case of Remittent Fever, arising from disordered Bowels, unaffected by Homoeopathic Treatment; cured by one dose of Allopathic Medicine—IV. Case of Fever—Extreme Exhaustion—	
Death threatened, from want of the use of Stimuli in the Homoeopathic Treatment of the Case—V. Case of Disease of the Heart—Supervention of acute Pleuritis and Pericarditis—Inefficacy of Homoeopathic Treatment—	
Death	159-162
App. E.—Inflammation of the Pleura unchecked by Homoeopathic Treatment—An Allopathic Practitioner consulted too late—Death	164
App. F.—Effect of the Imagination in the Production of Disease	166
App. G.—Effect of Imagination in Curing Disease—I. Case of Headache, Cured by Gestures—II. Cases of Cure by Metallic Tractors—III. Cures by the influence of Touch—Valentine Greatraks—IV. Cure of Scurvy by the influence of the Imagination—V. Instances of the influence of Imagination in the Cure of Disease	168-174
App. H.—Case, illustrative of the practice adopted by the Homoeopathists, of bestowing formidable names upon slight Affections, and so making an appearance of Wonderful Cures	185
App. I.—Case, strongly illustrative of the loose manner in which the Homoeopathic Cases are Reported, and showing how little reliance is to be placed on the published Cures of Homoeopathists	189

INTRODUCTION.

THE medical profession has been blamed for declining to test, experimentally, the curative powers of Homoeopathy, and the adherents of that system, following the example which Empirics have always set, have not hesitated to account for this, by imputing to the profession the most unworthy motives. Those who know any thing about medicine, must be well aware, that it is neither because Homoeopathy is novel, nor because, if true, it must overturn received opinions in medical practice, that it has experienced the treatment at the hands of the profession, against which its advocates have so loudly remonstrated. There is no new discovery which promises to be beneficial—no new science which promises, however remotely, to advance the healing art, that we do not eagerly investigate, and practically submit to the most calm and searching enquiry; and if Homoeopathy be not so treated, it is because its statements can be disproved by their opposition to facts already known, and by their contradiction of one another; and, therefore, they do not require the test of experiments to prove their absurdity. The child does not require to discover, experimentally, that two and two are not five, after he has learned that they

can only make four; neither will the mathematician listen to any pretended demonstration, that the three angles of a triangle are greater than two right angles, because he also has had it demonstrated, that they are together equal only to two; and the same holds good with more abstruse and less palpable propositions. Just thus it is with one acquainted with the science of medicine. He is daily occupied in examining, weighing, and comparing facts; and much that may appear plausible enough to the ignorant, may exhibit to him such gross absurdities and fallacies, that he is justified in at once rejecting it. True it is, that propositions in medicine cannot be reasoned about, proved, and disproved, with all the rigidity of mathematical demonstration; but yet there is quite enough of certainty in the science to avail us in the detection of gross fallacies, and enough of philosophy to render many errors at once apparent.

Medicine, in its present state, is a science of facts, the accumulated stores of the experience of many successive ages of observation; but it is a fundamental proposition in Homoeopathy, that if it be true, medicine must necessarily be false; the contest is, therefore, between two experiences—the one, the mushroom experience of Homoeopathy—the other, that which has been increasing for centuries, from the age of Hippocrates to the

present day. Nor let us suppose, that because the *theories* of medicine may have been altered, its *facts* have been thereby affected; they remain the same, amidst all the explanations which each successive theory has imposed on them. But, if we admit the theory of Homoeopathy, then the large proportion of what are established facts must be denied; nay, if Homoeopathy be true, their existence is impossible. As justly, then, might the Homoeopathist be blamed, for not personally performing all those experiments, which have been recorded in the professional writings of ages, and on which the present experience of medicine is founded. If these are true, Homoeopathy is false; and, till they are disproved, they still demand our confidence. If then the new invention is to be tested by the amount of experience for and against it, our decision must, undoubtedly, be destructive of its claims. Besides, we have Homoeopathic experiments recorded, some of which, we must all unavoidably have tried, viz:—the action of their remedies on a healthy body, and so contrary to ordinary experience are the results of these, that they outrage our reason though they excite our laughter.*

But, it has been argued, that there is much in medicine which we can neither deny nor

* See pages 46 to 60, and Appendix A.

explain ; it must, however, be remembered, that it is one thing for a fact to be incapable of explanation, in the present state of our knowledge, and, quite another, for it to be opposed to reason and common sense. If we have succeeded in proving that the statements of Homoeopathy are so opposed, then they are not of course to be believed on the same amount of evidence, on which facts, inexplicable, yet not contradictory to reason, might be received.

And it is evident, that to try such experiments in acute diseases (and they are the only proper subjects for them), would force us to abandon methods of treatment, which, in our *experience*, we have found to be successful ; and to contend against the most formidable diseases, with means, which, if reason, common sense, and ordinary experience are to be trusted, must be utterly powerless. Can this conscientiously be done ?

Medical men are not surprised at the success of which Homoeopathsists boast. Every day they are testing the efficacy of remedies, either newly introduced, or newly recommended for some particular disease. They have thus learned, that it is not only possible, but that it is almost universal, for the first proposer of a remedy to find it cure a multitude of diseases, and thus to rate its powers very highly ; while those, who, led by his representations, repeat his experiments, are almost inva-

riably disappointed in the results. It would be going beyond our province, to explain why this is the case; it is a deep-seated peculiarity of the human mind, and it is sufficient for us to know that it is so; and even were it otherwise, it is plain, that the very nature of medicine precludes the possibility of arriving at any certainty from its results, unless these were derived from observations much more extended than the Homoeopaths have as yet registered, or than they are ever likely to obtain.

Medicine has, indeed, its own certainty; a certainty very closely resembling that of the political and moral sciences; a practical certainty, and one to which Cabanis has given the name of "a certainty of probability;" but this certainty can never be *exclusively* founded upon the results of phenomena so fluctuating, so uncertain, and so uncontrollable, as are those of life. In sciences resembling medicine in these respects, the results are never regarded as the criteria of the science. In agriculture, for example, it is universally admitted, that many unforeseen occurrences may arise, to defeat plans the most judiciously conceived, and most scientifically executed; and, therefore, success or failure are not regarded as affording an infallible index of their wisdom. And are not many of the influences which powerfully affect the body, as much removed from the control of

the Physician, as are those on which the produce of the earth depends? Why then should a test, admitted to be inapplicable in the one case be demanded in the other?

For these reasons, then, is the argument in the following pages perfectly legitimate; and, if admitted, is conclusive against Homoeopathy. That it should produce its full effect, is more than can be expected by those who know the inveteracy of error. One thing, at least, is certain. The present delusion will not be permanent. It may not, indeed, fall before Reason, but it will undoubtedly shrivel, ere long, into mature decrepitude, and be supplanted by some other Charm, “radiant in all the freshness of youthful attraction.”

Let its supporters boast of the number of its adherents, this will but accelerate its fate. One who knew well the value of such evidence, thus appreciates it: “Universality is such a proof of truth, as truth itself is ashamed of, for universality is nothing but a quainter and trimmer name to signify the multitude. Now, human authority, at the strongest, is but weak; but the multitude is the weakest part of authority; it is the great patron of error, most easily abused, and most hardly disabused. The beginning of error may be, and mostly is, from private persons, but the maintainer and continuer of error is the multitude.”—(Hales.)

CHAPTER I.

Summary of Hahnemann's History—His attempt to obtain a Universal Law and Fixed Principles in Medicine—Impossibility of this, and its Causes—Consequences of the Attempt—Character of the Arguments in favour of Homoeopathy—Work of Dr. Black—Hahnemann unable to practise conscientiously without a Universal Law—*Is the Homoeopathic Law Universal—It is not, and why.*

*Learning itself, received into a mind
In reason weak, or perversely inclined,
Serves but to lead philosophers astray,
Where children would with ease discern the way.*

SAMUEL CHRISTIAN FREDERICK HAHNEMANN, the founder of Homoeopathy, was born at Meissen in Saxony, in 1755, and having studied medicine at Leipzig and Vienna, he received his degree from the university of Erlangen, after which he settled at Gommern.* He there occupied himself in translating a number of works from the English, French, and Italian languages, in the study of chemistry, and in furnishing various contributions to the different German journals, from

* Russell on the Origin and Progress of Homoeopathy; Brit. Journ. of Homoeopathy, No. 1.

which we may infer that his practice must have been very limited.

The course of speculative study which he thus pursued, was calculated to alienate him still farther from the practical part of his profession; accordingly, he at last abandoned it altogether, "because it afforded no great principle by which he could, in all cases, guide his course."

"In homoeopathy," observes his biographer, "it is especially true, that the origin and progress of the science is to be best traced in the mind of him to whom it owes its birth." In this we cordially concur, and shall, therefore, endeavour to show how the peculiarities of Hahnemann's mind led him to the invention of homoeopathy. Naturally active and inquiring, and prone, from his earliest years, to abstract speculation, he might have been distinguished in his profession, had his theoretical tendencies been corrected by practice. Unfortunately, however, never devoting himself ardently to it, he abandoned it altogether, at the very time when he required its corrective most, so that, like an unskilful seaman, while setting every sail to the wind, he hove the ballast overboard.

How could one, *practically* familiar with the various and opposing *facts* of medicine, expect to comprehend them all under any one general law, or hope to obtain definite results in a science, the very nature of which precluded such a possi-

bility? It is evident, that the results or laws arrived at in any science, are nothing more than certain circumstances of general agreement in any number of its phenomena, therefore, the nature of its phenomena must regulate the character of its laws. But in physical sciences, we have to do with physical phenomena — facts definite and certain; whereas, in medical science, we have to deal with psychological facts, involving the idea of life, which, ever varying and uncontrollable, cannot be subjected to a system of the same rigid experimentalism, and cannot, therefore, furnish the same definite laws.

It was, because he could not transfer to the facts of the one class, all the certainty of the facts of the other, that Hahnemann, “disheartened by a pursuit that mocked his toil, and plunged him only deeper in doubt,” forsook medicine, “and occupied himself with chemistry and authorship.”

Had he stopped here, his genius and perseverance might have won for him high honours; unfortunately, however, he returned again to medicine, determined to make observations in it as certain and definite as those of chemistry, and to obtain laws as general and precise. The consequence was, as might have been foreseen, that he has become the inventor of a system far more theoretical, and far more fanciful, than any which preceded it; for, whereas other theorists have

made their doctrines in some degree to correspond with their facts, the facts of Hahnemann are contrived to support his doctrines, and phenomena, having no relation to each other, are forced into analogies, to give an apparent probability to the general law superimposed.

Starting from an imaginary fact, the pretensions of which we shall take occasion hereafter to examine, Hahnemann, no longer a medical practitioner, but a chemist and author, speculating upon medicine in his study, instead of examining disease at the bed side, proclaimed himself the discoverer of a universal law of medicine. This law is, that all diseases are to be cured with remedies which have the power of producing, in the healthy body, symptoms similar to those of the disease; or, as Hahnemann expressed it,—“*Similia similibus curantur.*” (Like is cured by like).

“Now, here we meet with the fallacy that runs through the whole of the homoeopathic theory. Similarity of symptoms, not similarity of diseases, lies, as Schultz justly remarks, at the base of all their therapeutic proceedings; and if they had not taken refuge in a Latin axiom, which has amply served the purpose of mystification, the so called *scientific* theory of Hahnemann would, long since, have been seen to deserve that character as little as did the old doctrine of signatures.”*

* Brit. and For. Med. Review, No. 33, p. 223.

“ When the mind,” says Bacon, “ is once pleased with certain things, it draws all others to consent and go along with them ; and though the power and number of instances that make for the contrary are greater, yet it either attends not to them, or despises them ; or else removes and rejects them by a distinction, with a strong and pernicious prejudice, to maintain the authority of its first choice inviolate.”* So Hahnemann, having invented the law, attempted to establish its truth and universality, by a series of experiments, of so extraordinary a character, that they lead us to doubt, whether he *really could* believe any thing founded upon them.

Partly by the most unqualified abuse of the present system of medicine, always a favourite trick of the empiric, partly by a parade of *assumptions* as indubitable *facts*, and chiefly by an air of plausibility, which, through a liberal use of vague analogies, he has contrived to give his works, they gained some credit with the superficially informed, and those altogether unacquainted with medical science. On the Continent, their circulation received an additional stimulus, from the immorality and obscenity with which some of them abound, and which enable the licentious to pander to their degrading tastes,

* Bacon, Nov. Org. Aph. xlvii.

and indulge their prurient curiosity under the guise of scientific investigation.*

This new form of quackery has, of course, a host of imitators, whom we are given to understand, Hahnemann himself repudiated; and this country, always proverbial for its credulity, has not escaped their visitation.

Edinburgh, too, has its professors of homoeopathy, one of whom has lately given to the world a book,† consisting principally of translations from the works of Hahnemann. In some cases, undoubtedly, the author ventures to differ from, and even contradict his great master, chiefly in statements, which, credulous as the British public is, would scarcely go down here; and prudence has forced him to suppress the grosser indecencies, although even from these his book is not altogether free.‡ As, by the exertions of the homoeopaths, this work has obtained a forced circulation, which the merits of the system never could have given it; and as, on this account, it is probably better known here than any of the other English treatises on the subject, we shall, for the

* We had trusted that this country would long escape the visitation of this offensive species of literature, but we find reason to deplore the publication of too much of it in "Jahr's Manual of Homoeopathic Medicine," translated by J. Laurie, M.D., with a Preface by P. Currie, M.D.

† A Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Homoeopathy, by Francis Black, M.D. London, 1842. 8vo, pp. 239.

‡ See, for example, his rules for examining disease in females, at page 130.

most part, draw our illustrations from it, and only occasionally refer to the more recondite homoeopathic authorities.

The first division of the work of Hahnemann, and the first chapter of that of Dr. Black, are characteristically occupied with a detail of the imperfections of medical science, chiefly drawn from the statements of allopathic* practitioners; and we cannot help thinking, that their modest, manly, and straight-forward admissions, contrast not unfavourably with the pretensions to unattainable perfection made by homoeopaths. We do not hesitate to admit, that medicine is, and must necessarily be an imperfect science; not because its cultivators are deficient in zeal, or ignorant of the method in which that zeal should be directed, but on account of the nature of the inquiries about which it is chiefly conversant. It is imperfect, because it has to deal, not with the simple relations of matter; but with organization, ever varying and governed, in its innumerable changes, by a subtle principle, of the laws of action, of which we are entirely ignorant; nay, the very existence of which we recognise only by its effects. It is imperfect, because the most extended series of correct observations can never claim implicit confidence, because there are no two human beings perfectly alike—no two cases

* Allopath, or allopathist, is the name bestowed on the regular practitioner by the homoeopaths.

of disease identical—no two functions altogether similar—in short, no two facts of the class on which medicine rests, which either are, or can be made counterparts of each other. While the honest practitioner has never attempted to conceal these defects, but, on the contrary, has often pointed them out as the source of the difficulties which are encountered in practice, the dishonest charlatan, forgetting that it has always been easier to destroy one science than to build up another on its ruins, has ever found them a ready means of weakening the public faith in the old system; thus hoping to prepare the way for the professions of the new.

Our object, however, is not to defend medicine, but to expose homoeopathy; not to prove that there is no error in the former, but that there is little truth in the latter; not to show that medicine is incapable of improvement, but that it is not from homoeopathy that improvement is to be expected.

Of the two, it were perhaps the easier task to dwell upon the high character which medical science is attaining, to point out the laborious means by which this has been effected, and to show what is yet to be hoped for from enlightened energy and well directed zeal; and if we avoid this, it is only because it is not our province. Could the homoeopathists show, that if medicine was proved to be false, their pretensions must, of

necessity, be true, we might take this more pleasant way of disputing these pretensions; as matters stand, however, we shall not seek to shelter ourselves behind lines of defence, however impregnable, but shall carry the war at once into the camp of our opponent.

Hahnemann abandoned the practice of medicine because he could not satisfactorily answer this question, "How is it possible, with conscientious fidelity, to discharge this my trust? Is there no great principle by which I can guide this my course?" *

The practice which he thus conscientiously abandoned, he resumed, on the discovery of the homoeopathic law, hence that law must have afforded him *the* great principle which he desired, and without which, "at the risk of indigence, he refused to treat disease." Let us now inquire to what extent the homoeopaths believe that principle to be really applicable,—admitting, in the meantime, that it is a principle, and is applicable at all. The homoeopathic law is proclaimed to be "universal;"† and so convinced do its advocates profess to be of its universality, that they tell us it is their practice, "to adopt whatever is consonant with it, and dismiss whatever is opposed."‡ But is it so? Did Hahnemann find

* Russell, op. cit. p. 3.

† Black, p. 45.

‡ Ibid. p. 203.

that the law, without which he could not conscientiously treat disease, was *really* one admitting of universal application? Unhesitatingly we answer, he did not; for, whatever may be the claims of homoeopathy, the universality of its law cannot be successfully maintained; as it is evident, that to demand universality for any one law of cure, is virtually to deny the possibility of a cure having ever been effected by means opposed to that law, and of course to assert, that every disease, not absolutely incurable, may be removed by means in accordance with it.

Perhaps it is scarcely necessary to show, that in *some* of its laws, allopathy is directly opposed to the law,—“*similia similibus curantur* ;” so much opposed, that Dr. Black has declared the two systems to be absolutely incompatible. It follows, then, 1st, that if homoeopathy be true, and its law universal, the old system of medicine can never have made one successful cure, unless when by accident a homoeopathic remedy was stumbled upon; and, 2d, that homoeopathy, resting on a universal law, must be adequate to combat every curable disease.

Although popular experience, statistical tables, and indubitable facts evidently prove, that just in proportion as medical science has advanced—in a *direction*, be it observed, *diametrically opposite to that which homoeopathy indicates*,—have our

bills of mortality diminished, our hospital cures increased, and the value of human life been raised : * yet, must Dr. Black demonstrate, that the science by which all these have been effected, rests on a false foundation, and is positively injurious in practice. Of this Dr. Black seems quite aware, and boldly asserts, that medicine, as ordinarily practised, “ though it may in many cases palliate, never cures directly.” What would be the thoughts of most men, when assured, that the medical art was altogether a delusion ; nay, worse than a delusion ; that it was a means of *increasing* the power of disease ?

Would they not be inclined to say, Indeed ! but we have had an attack of constipation ; a purgative was taken and it was cured. We were seized with inflammation ; a vein was opened, and as the blood

* The following extract is subjoined, in proof of this assertion, from an author, who, not himself a medical man, and writing merely as a statist, will not be supposed to have any bias in favour of medicine.

“ The progress of medical science has tended to diminish the number of deaths in Britian. In the great hospital of St. Bartholomew, they were,—

“ In 1689,—1 in 7.

In 1813,—1 in 16.

1740,— „ 10.

1827,— „ 48.

1780,— „ 14.”

—*Von Raumer's England*, vol. ii. p. 27.

The following, from M'Culloch's Dictionary, shows the vast decrease of mortality in the whole population :—

In 1740,—1 in 35.

In 1800,—1 in 47.

1780,— „ 40.

1810,— „ 53.

1790,— „ 45.

1820,— „ 59.

† Black, p. 2.

flowed, our pain became less and less; when the arm was bound up, it was gone, and in a few days we were completely restored. We were affected with diarrhœa; one dose of the medicine our physician prescribed lessened our sufferings, a second was taken and they were gone! The cure, in these cases, followed the remedies so directly, that we had no hesitation in regarding the one as cause, and the other as effect. *No doubt could exist* as to the powers of the remedies; nay, our physician had previously told us what effect they would have, and why they were given;—we took them, and found he was correct!

But, according to the principles of the homoeopaths, it must be shown, that all this was a delusion, and that the remedies prescribed not only did not cure, but positively augmented the disease.

When we consider that the allopathic method has been in operation for centuries, what a rich field must it not disclose for such ingenious labourers as the homoeopaths, and how must they be puzzled, not to procure instances enough of its murderous triumphs, but to select from the host such as are most awful and appalling.

But, instead of proving the *universal* failure of that which is opposed to their *universal* law, homoeopaths are reduced to the miserable expedient of seizing on certain abuses in practice, *which allopathic practitioners themselves have*

condemned, and of holding these up as fair examples of what they sneer at as “rational practice.” *

Blood-letting, for example, is condemned in uterine hæmorrhage, and in mania, as if it was the routine practice in these affections, whereas

* We must here, once for all, protest against a system which pervades the works both of Hahnemann and Dr. Black. Assuming that certain doctrines are held by the allopathic school, they employ much ingenuity in combating them, while, in many instances, the doctrines they thus disprove, are purely the inventions of their own fertile imaginations. For example, Dr. Black asserts, that, “until the present time, it has been the theory of the allopathic schools of medicine, that the external parts only were affected in local diseases, and that the rest of the body did not participate in the disease—an absurd theoretical proposition that has led to the most pernicious therapeutic system,” p. 136. Again, “it is equally absurd and dangerous to regard these symptoms that are purely local, and to treat them exclusively, or nearly so, by topical applications, in which manner they have been treated till the present day.”

Now, it is only two or three years since Dr. Black was a student at the Edinburgh school of medicine, where he must have heard very different doctrines taught; and it is no wonder, that if he in his ignorance has imagined such were the principles of medicine, he abandoned its practice for almost any theory which chance threw in his way. It is scarcely credible, that an individual, who had studied medicine at all, could be ignorant that Abernethy wrote a book “On the Constitutional Origin of Local Diseases,” which is still a standard work, and constantly referred to. If, knowing this, he penned the paragraphs we have quoted, what are we to think of his integrity? If ignorant of it, what are we to think of the literature of one, whose book, nevertheless, abounds in ostentatiously paraded quotations! Does it not justify the statement of a recent reviewer, that “Dr. Black’s pretensions to literary research are amusing, and as great as is his ignorance of the literature of medicine. The references in foot-notes are chiefly copied, though this is not stated.”—*Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, No. xxvii. p. 229.

every intelligent allopathic practitioner will cordially concur in Dr. Black's censure of it; in fact, he cites the condemnation of allopathic authorities in all these cases. And, in diseases where allopathists consider blood-letting admissible, how logically does Dr. Black show its injurious effects!! "Speranza," it seems, "has published some remarkable cases, which show, that among patients attacked with pneumonia, the deaths were in direct proportion to the number of bleedings," p. 6. Therefore, we are to conclude, they were caused by the bleedings! Is it not more likely, that the activity of the treatment may be an index of the severity of the attack, and in *this* way bear a proportion to the issue of the case?

Another example, given of the failure of allopathic practice, founded on this maxim, is as follows:—

"Take, for example, a person labouring under some violent neuralgic affection. Small doses of a sedative, say opium, or its preparations, are given. The pain is relieved, but next day it returns; the dose must be repeated. Day after day it is not only repeated, but increased. What is the consequence? The sufferings may be relieved; but the drug, in addition to removing pain, acts otherwise; it disorders the digestive organs, causes headach, constipation, &c., rendering the patient miserable, so much so, that the

relief is far from being equivalent to the disordered health."

In such cases as these, it is plain, that opium was not given for the removal of the disease, but for the mitigation of the sufferings of the patient. What, we would ask, did homoeopathy do for the five patients who applied with this disease at the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary, and whom their own report does not even pretend that they cured?

When such cases *admit of cure*, our treatment is very different; and well may the talented reviewer, to whom we have already alluded, place beside such a statement as that, the case of Mr. Spry, of Charter House Square, as reported by Mr. Skey.

"About the month of August, 1835, he was recommended to try the effect of the aconitine, five grains of which were rubbed down with five drachms of cerate. The first application subdued the pain in a partial degree. It was applied according to the degree of pain, either once or twice in the day, for six days only, when the pain ceased entirely; nor has he suffered from relapse to the present hour, a period of fourteen months."*

Again, in discussing the treatment by revulsives, Dr. Black cites examples equally inconclu-

* Monthly Journal, No. xxvii.

sive. It is strange, that one, who professes for his school so great an admiration for the “*vis medicatrix naturæ*,” should have failed to perceive, that the revulsive treatment is founded on the fact, that many diseases disappeared spontaneously, upon the occurrence of others in distant parts; as, for example, spontaneous eruptions on the skin, relieving diseases of the internal organs, and *vice versa*. Now, such practice as this is directly opposed to homoeopathy, and should therefore afford many examples of the injurious effect of ordinary practice; and yet, strange to say, we find our author arguing again, not from its use but from its abuse; *e.g.* “Setons and vesicatories are *recklessly* applied,” p. 7; and again, “no one can be ignorant of the unfortunate effect arising from the *abuse* of purgatives,” p. 7. Such, then, is all that can be said against methods of cure which have been acted upon since the days of Hippocrates, and which, if homoeopathy be true, and its law universal, must afford innumerable instances of directly injurious effects. But this, which is essential to the truth of their position, the homoeopaths cannot,—dare not say; and, indeed, Dr. Black, aware that he *must* admit the *possibility* of its effecting a cure, seeks to prejudice the public against it, not because being opposed to his universal law, if it ever cures, homoeopathy must be false; but because “the remedies are

administered in large, and, therefore, *unpleasant* doses." How similar is the history of quackery in every age!

As the homoeopaths have so miserably failed in proving the practice of medicine to be injurious, in so far as it opposes their "general law," and have drawn their arguments against it only from its abuses, they have placed themselves in a worse position than if they had never made the attempt: incomplete as such omission would have left the argument for the universality of the homoeopathic law.

But, in the second place, it is plain, that if the law be universal, the practice founded upon it (*i.e.* the homoeopathic practice), must be adequate to the removal of every curable disease. That this is necessary, is evident; for if there *be any* forms of disease which homoeopathy *cannot* cure, and yet which are curable by *other* means, it must be admitted, that there are other laws capable of doing what the homoeopathic cannot, and, therefore, that the latter is *at least* not universal. This we are fortunate in being able to prove, by the admissions of homoeopaths themselves.

For Dr. Black admits, that "in cases of poisoning it is necessary to have recourse to emetics," that "in asphyxia and syncope, when the power of reaction is almost destroyed, it is

necessary to have recourse to speedy stimuli,—*stimuli which cannot be afforded by homoeopathic medicine,*” p. 163.

And, again, although Dr. Black, in p. 4, when opposing the allopathic practice, declares, that “the practice of blood-letting is in itself dangerous from impairing the vital energies,” he allows, p. 164, that according to the opinion of some homoeopaths, there are “instances in which blood-letting acts beneficially in rousing the vital activity.”

Again, when objecting to allopathic practice, we find the following passage:—“In habitual constipation, a purgative is administered, the bowels are opened, but soon reaction succeeds, and is superadded to the existing constipation,” p. 3.

But, strange to say, homoeopaths have themselves nothing better to propose, for we find, at p. 64,—“When offending matter exists in the stomach, or intestinal canal, the first step is to get rid of it, by means of a gentle emetic, or aperient, such as castor oil!!”

And, again,—“In individuals who have long laboured under constipation, it often happens that the homoeopathic remedies fail, for a few days, in procuring an evacuation.” Fail for a few days! And do they succeed *then*? Yes! because, in the mean time, the homoeopathic

physician is directed "*occasionally to employ the allopathic remedy, of "an enema of tepid water,"*" p. 64.

In syphilis, too, it is proved to demonstration, by the experiments of Ricord, that if the ulcerations are destroyed by caustic, within three or four days from the application of the virus, the disease is arrested, and prevented from becoming constitutional. But against this, because it does not tally with his *universal* law, Hahnemann sets his face, allowing the disease to go on till the constitution is affected.

Dr. Black, knowing that such practice will not go down in this country, candidly acknowledges the error of his master, and proposes to treat the disease allopathically. But having already declaimed against the "violent means" which allopathy resorts to, as entailing pain and annoyance upon the patient, he feels it necessary to apologise for the use of the caustic; and adds, "the application of a cautery may appear repulsive to most of the homoeopathic school, but a similar course is followed by Hering, one of Hahnemann's most ardent followers, in the prophylaxis of hydrophobia, where he recommends "heat *

* If we cannot use mild remedies, let us at least give severe ones mild names, seems to be "an universal law" of homoeopathy.

to be applied to the wound." We can scarcely add any thing to the force of such quotations as these, proving, as they amply do, that the practice of homoeopathy is to be departed from at certain times; nay, to repeat Dr. Black's own words, there are remedies demanded, "which cannot be afforded by homoeopathic medicine," and its *universal* curative law. If homoeopathic practice requires such inconsistencies, it is no wonder that Dr. Black finds those who profess it liable to become "a class of practitioners, who merit the indignation of every right-minded man, a class who, viewing medicine only as a trade, a mere barter of pounds, shillings, and pence, act obsequiously as the patient wishes; at his desire, their practice is either homoeopathic or allopathic. *Such unprincipled procedure admits of no apology*, (p. 163). Might not the detection of some such proceeding have suggested "to that original and extraordinary genius Richter," to give to Hahnemann the appellation of "that rare double head," (p. 20), in which the homoeopaths glory, though we think the compliment somewhat ambiguous?

It is interesting, too, to observe the kind of cases in which homoeopathy is to be departed from: "Those of poisoning,"—"urgent cases, where life seems almost extinguished,"—all cases of external injury," and "syphilis," the

treatment of which is better understood by the public than that of internal diseases; and with these last, therefore, the empiric may trifle with less *immediate* danger, and less fear of his incapacity being detected.

What shall we now say to the universality of the homoeopathic law? Have those who abandoned the profession of medicine, because they could not conscientiously practice it without some great principle to guide their course, found in homoeopathy that great principle? And if so, in how many diseases is it to be taken as a guide? Or how are we to discover when to follow, or when to depart from it? How are we to appease the accusations of conscience, when required to prescribe for those cases which cannot be treated in accordance with the homoeopathic law? Are the homoeopathists entitled "to adopt whatever is consonant with it, and dismiss whatever is opposed?"* Have they not, by so doing, placed themselves among a class of pseudo-philosophers, against whom Bacon directed the memorable censure, that "He who is not practised in doubting, but forward in asserting and laying down such principles as he takes to be approved, granted, and manifest, and according to the established truth thereof, receives or rejects every

* Black, p. 203.

thing as squaring with, or proving contrary to them, is only fitted to mix and confound things with words, reason with madness, and the world with fable and fiction, but not interpret the works of nature ?”

CHAPTER II.

All Truth rests on Evidence—Varieties of Evidence, and their Results—Intuition and Demonstration—Observation—Such Truths the Foundations of Science—Testimony, its Value—The alleged Facts of Homoeopathy not necessary Truths—It claims to be an Inductive Science—What that demands—Well ascertained Facts—Examination of the Homoeopathic Facts—Homoeopathic Experiments not entitled to credit, and why.

And if, in the meantime, among all the chances of experiments, he throws out any which appear either new or useful, he feeds his mind with these as so many earnest; boasts and extolls them above measure; and conceives great hopes of what is behind.—BACON.

THE object of all research is the discovery of truth; the results of all successful research must, therefore, be true; but to determine the truth of any proposition, it is necessary to ascertain how far it is in conformity with the nature and reality of things. For this purpose, an act of the judgment is requisite. Every conclusion of the judgment must be the result of evidence, the character of the evidence required being determined by the nature of the truth to which it relates.

In the first place, the correspondence of the

proposition with realities may be perceived instantaneously; the judgment, in such a case, is said to be intuitive, the evidence intuitive also, and the truth necessary.

In the second place, the proposition may be deduced by a process of reasoning from principles already agreed to. Such truths are necessary, and yet may not be intuitive. The evidence on which they are founded is demonstrative.

Intuition and demonstration are, however, by their nature, comparatively rare; hence we are compelled to rest belief, in many instances, on a much lower degree of evidence—that of our own consciousness, or the testimony of our fellow men.

In physical subjects, for example, no demonstration, properly speaking, can be obtained, except as far as certain experiments are actually observed by our senses, or related by those who have observed them.

Such conclusions rest, therefore, on observation, which is the foundation of experience also. They can never be opposed to experience, without either the one or the other being false; for either the new conclusions must modify our former experience, or our former experience refuse assent to these more recent apparent conclusions.

Truths thus obtained may form the foundations of science, for science is, in fact, merely a system,

consisting of an arranged collection of truths, deduced from first principles.

But there may be truths which do not fall under either of these heads—propositions which, so far from being intuitively true, may seem at first sight impossible, which, so far from resting on experience, may appear opposed to it. These are truths of a marvellous character, which we receive and believe on the authority of testimony, only because it would be still more surprising for such testimony to deceive us. Such truths can never form a science, although we may be warranted in acting upon them to the extent to which they are individually applicable.

Under one or other of these heads, then, must the alleged truths of homoeopathy be ranged; let us examine them, and decide to which they belong.

As the advocates of homoeopathy claim for it a place among the “positive sciences,” we are entitled to expect, that its truths should be either self-evident or demonstrative.

Can such statements as the following be called self-evident truths, viz.:—“That all diseases are to be cured by giving substances, having the power of producing similar ones in the healthy subject;” as astringents in constipation, purgatives in diarrhœa, stimulants in inflammation, &c.—That “although theorists pretend that dilution weakens the power of a drug, homoeopathic experience proves the con-

trary" *—" That substances, such as gold, silver, platinum, or charcoal, which have no action on man, in their ordinary state, will, if beat for an hour, with another substance, destitute of medicinal properties, acquire prodigious power; so that, if the quadrillionth of a grain of gold, so treated, be enclosed in a phial, and inhaled by a melancholic patient, in whom the disgust of life has led almost to suicide; before one hour, this unfortunate being will be delivered from his fatal demon, and reinstated in his enjoyment of life." † —That the shaking of medicines develops their action to so extraordinary a degree, that experience has forced Hahnemann to reduce the number of shakes given at each dilution, from ten to two; ‡ nay, that of such importance is the *manner* and frequency of the rubbing or shaking, that in mixing a powder with sugar, the exact period to rub it must be mentioned in the pharmacopœia, and that in dissolving a solid, it is necessary to tell us to move the phial, "*circa axim suam*," and, at each attenuation, to shake it twice, "*bis, brachio, quidem bis moto concute*." §

That such substances as crude antimony, of which Rayer gave half an ounce, for several days, without the slightest effect, || will, if given in

* Hahnemann, Nov Org. Aph. clxxxiv.

† Ibid. page 305.

‡ Ibid, page 290.

§ Quin's Pharmacopœia Homœopathica.

|| Dict. de Med. et Chir. Pratiq. iii. 64.

doses of one octillionth, or one decillionth of a grain, produce 215 different symptoms,* *and that these symptoms continue to be produced for above sixty days after the medicine is swallowed!!*† and a crowd of similar absurdities, which our limits will not permit us to quote.

Nor can such statements as these be deduced by any process of reasoning, from facts with which we are already familiar; they are, therefore, not demonstrative truths.

The propositions of homoeopathy not being self-evident, or capable of demonstration; as a science, it must depend on observation for its evidence, and in no case can mere observation prove a proposition to be universally true; although, as we have shown, universality has been claimed for the homoeopathic law. Experience can never give a universality which it does not itself possess. The one claim is manifestly incompatible with the other, but neither, we think, can be successfully maintained.

The claim of homoeopathy to be regarded as an inductive science, is put forward by Dr. Black in the following sentence:—

“It” (homoeopathy) “was discovered in conformity to that fundamental principle, that the basis of all our knowledge is the accurate observation of natural phenomena; and the correct

* Jahr, Manual of Homoeopathic.

† Quin. op, cit., p. 145.

generalization of these phenomena should be the sole foundation of all our reasoning,"* p. 56.

An inductive science demands three essentials:—1st, That the facts from which it starts should be clear and undoubted: 2d, That the facts at which it arrives should present the same character: 3d, That the inferences by which these two classes of facts are connected, should be evidently deducible from the one class, and should evidently lead to the other.

Let us enquire how far homoeopathy fulfills these conditions.

Are the *facts* (as they are termed) from which the science sprung, as undeniable as the homoeopaths assume; or is the process by which the law was established entitled to be called induction?

It is laid down by Whewell, as a pre-requisite to the building up of every science, "that we shall already have obtained a supply of definite and certain facts, free from obscurity and doubt."† Hahnemann and all his followers having assumed, that what they choose to regard and employ as facts, are really and indubitably to be admitted as such; it becomes essential, first, to analyze these assertions (for at present, we can give them no

* We think it better to give such quotations in the ipsissima verba of the author, though his meaning is often obscured, by the inaccurate phraseology which he adopts.

† Whewell on the Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, vol. ii. p. 192.

higher title), and endeavour to ascertain what in them is to be admitted as true, and what rejected as false.

“ It cannot be doubted, that in selecting the facts which are to form the foundation of science, we must reduce them to their most simple and certain form, and must reject every thing from which doubt or error may arise.”*

What then are the homoeopathic facts? Cinchona, given to a healthy person, produces symptoms analogous to intermittent fever. This *fact* struck Hahnemann; (*Black*, p. 18.) It led him to the discovery of the homoeopathic law. Is it a fact or is it not?

Were the febrile symptoms which occasionally follow *large* doses of bark, manifested with a frequency at all corresponding to its curative powers in ague, we should expect very often to meet with them; for there is no medicine so largely taken as a tonic, in cases where no real disease exists.

But are the febrile symptoms which bark, *in common with other tonics produces*, really analogous to those of ague? We find that cinchona, given in large quantities, to a healthy individual, produces febrile symptoms in virtue of its stimulant power; but can Dr. Black prove that it

* Whewell on the Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, vol. ii. p. 196.

cures *fever*? Ague, it certainly does cure; but does it usually produce, in a healthy person, that symptom which alone distinguishes ague from all other fevers—periodicity?

Hahnemann, indeed, contends, in some of his works, that it does, but his mere assertion is any thing but sufficient proof, especially as there are multitudes who have taken it in considerable quantity, without experiencing such effects; while, if it cures ague in virtue of this power, the manifestation of the power should be co-extensive with its curative influence in that disease. In answer then to the question, does bark, taken by a healthy person, produce an intermittent fever? We reply, Certainly not; and therefore, in violation of all homoeopathic law, bark, producing in a healthy person, symptoms resembling those of *continued* fever, cannot cure *that*, while, on the other hand, it cures intermittent fever, symptoms resembling which it does not produce. The force of this argument is considerably increased by the fact, that bark appears to cure ague, not on account of any power which it exercises over the fever, but because of some peculiar influence which it has, not over ague alone, but over every disease which presents the true *periodic* character. “Although familiarly called a febrifuge, it has really no power of arresting or subduing the febrile state generally. Its anti-febrile properties are limited to those fevers

which present the character of periodicity. On this account, and, likewise, because it also arrests other periodic diseases, such as neuralgia, cinchona ought rather to be designated as an anti-periodic than a febrifuge." *

It is strange, then, that although Hahnemann found bark produce, in a healthy person, "chronic catarrh," "diarrhœa," "passive hæmorrhages," "strumous ophthalmia" (read and tremble, all ye who, for your stomach's sake, take quinine!), yet (with the exception of ague) periodical diseases, in the cure of which it is found almost specific, are not said to follow its use; and the periodicity of ague, which alone renders it curable by bark, is not proved to be produced.

Hahnemann having thus, from the supposed power of bark, got a glimpse, as he imagined, of a new therapeutic law—proceeded—not to investigate its truth, we fear we are compelled to say, but to discover parallels to it; and it is no wonder, when we consider the way in which his experiments were conducted, that instead of leading to truth, they should only have confirmed his preconceived opinions.

The professed object of Hahnemann was to ascertain the real powers of medicine, so that the selection of each appropriate remedy might be no

* Christison's Dispensatory, p. 335.

longer matter of doubt. We shall now inquire in what manner he pursued his researches.

The materials for such an inquiry exist in the numerous experiments performed, or said to have been performed, by Hahnemann and his followers, on what they call the pathogenetic powers of remedies, or those changes which they produce on a person in health.

We shall not stay to refute the assertion, that Hahnemann was the first to investigate into the effects of remedies on the healthy body, nor to point out, that the inquiries in the same path, made years before by Alexander, are referred to in Cullen's *Materia Medica* (the work which Hahnemann was translating, when what is called his great discovery, burst upon him), but shall at once proceed to determine the real character of these experiments.

A minute examination, and a full consideration of them, enables us most unhesitatingly to affirm, that they are not entitled to the slightest confidence, and are irreconcilable with known facts; that they are so absurd, we feel ashamed to be obliged to refute them, and so obscene, that we regret to confess having read them.

They are not entitled to the slightest confidence, because, 1st, No man could have produced in himself one tithe of the diseases which they record, as following the employment of their remedies, without both shortening his life, and

exposing himself to the most fearful sufferings; and yet Dr. Black assures us,

“ If the experience of Hahnemann and many of his followers is any encouragement, we need fear little permanent injury to our health, from carefully conducted experiments. Our venerable founder, still full of vigour, and in his eighty-eighth year, seems, from such trials, to have been enabled to resist the ordinary vicissitudes of common life.” *

We have laid it down as a fundamental rule, not to advance any statement, which we are unable to substantiate with full and indubitable proof; and we shall, therefore, proceed to unmask the character of the homoeopathic experiments, and to show, that the assertion we have made respecting them is not unfounded.

Even Dr. Black is startled by the fearful array of tortures, to which his German friends are said to have submitted, and thus accounts for them,—

“ The first and third sources of our *Materia Medica*,” viz. :—The administration of poisons, and the results of the successful treatment of disease by simple remedies, “ will account fully for the presence of many dangerous symptoms, ranked under several drugs; symptoms so formidable, that they are liable to shake the faith of many, who look only partially into the homoeo-

* Black on Homoeopathy, p. 65.

pathic *Materia Medica*.” * To prevent any risk of being misled in this way, we shall avoid all reference to the more powerful remedies, and present a few specimens of the effects said to have been produced by the *milder* agents, and to which we are required to believe, that the homoeopathic experimenters submitted with sufficient frequency, to ensure certainty as to the symptoms being really the effect of the medicine.

We shall take the remedies in alphabetical order, to show that we are not influenced in our selection by any *peculiar* absurdity, giving the symptoms from Dr. Laurie’s translation of Jahr’s *Manual of Homoeopathic Medicine*.

ALUM.—This substance has been given in large doses by allopathic practitioners. MM. Kapeler and Gendrin have administered three drachms at one dose, in *colica pictonum*,† and we are not aware, that the presence of that disease should prevent the development of any poisonous power the remedy may possess; if the homoeopathists assert the contrary, with them lies the burden of the proof.

Among the *trivial!* and *transient!* symptoms which it is alleged that the experimenters with this substance suffered, we find the following,—
“Leprous pimples,” “scurf, and running sores,”

* Black on Homoeopathy, p. 65.

† Devergie, Méd. Lég., ii. 656.

“rhagades (cutaneous fissures),” one of the most obstinate of skin diseases, “congestion of blood in the head,” one form of apoplexy, “paralysis of the eyelid,” “ulceration of the nostrils,” “leprous tubercles in the face,” “ulcers of the gums,” “colic,” “PROTRUSION AND INCARCERATION OF INGUINAL RUPTURE!!!” “Piles,” “tearing in the arms, from the shoulders to the fingers,” “pain, *as if burned by a hot iron*, in the elbows and the fingers,” “tettors, and moist sores on the arms.”

ANGUSTURA.—Used largely by the allopathic school, as an aromatic bitter, in doses of from 10 to 30 grains. When taken by a homoeopath, it is alleged to produce “paralysis of different parts,” “attacks of tetanus,” “CARIES AND PAINFUL ULCERS, WHICH ATTACK THE BONES, AND PERFORATE THEM EVEN TO THE MARROW!!” “Trismus” (lock-jaw), “dry cough, with rattling and scraping in the chest,” “violent deep cough,” “palpitation of the heart with anguish,” “cramp in the chest,” “paralysis of the joints of the feet.”

ARGENTUM.—This substance, in the crude state, is believed by the allopaths to be totally inert. When taken by homoeopaths, it produces many symptoms of the more severe kinds. What follows may serve as a specimen,—“Sensation of excoriation in the skin and internal organs,” “ATTACKS OF EPILEPSY,” “soreness of the

throat, as if forerunning a tumour in the gullet," "cutting pains in the abdomen." *

ANTIMONY.—This substance has no well marked effect on the healthy body. Rayer gave half an ounce, for several days, without any perceptible effect.

The following are a few of the more violent symptoms, said, by homoeopathists, to follow its use. "*Inflammation of the tendons,*" principally "after having drunk wine," "*after a meal,*" "emaciation," "*dropsical swelling of the whole body,*" "*miliary eruptions,*" "*nettle rash,*" "*lumps and blisters,*" "*fistulous ulcers,*" "*corns,*" "deformed and discoloured nails," "drowsiness with delirium," "intermittent fever—bilious affections," "*vomiting,*" "diarrhœa," "madness," "*intoxication,*" "apoplexy," "*congestion in the head,* followed by epistaxis," "falling off of hair," "*inflamed eyes,*" "blindness," "deafness," "scurvy in the nose," "toothache," "inability to swallow," "after a meal dejection, fulness and tension in the abdomen," "cramp in the stomach, and a desire to drown one's self," "burning in the fleshy part of the great toe," &c.†

Need we quote farther on this head? If four substances of such an innocuous character as

* Jahr's Manual of Homoeopathic Med., vol. i.

† For additional illustrations, see Appendix A.

those which we have quoted as examples, produced such symptoms as the above, to what state must the martyr homoeopathists have been reduced, before they succeeded in proving “the 150 medicines, of which the pathogenetic effects are well known; to which may be added fifty more, the actions of which are only partially proved,”*—and before the 88th year was reached.

2d, These experiments are not entitled to the slightest confidence, because the experimenters record every subsequent sensation and every subsequent appearance, as if it were really the effect of the substance swallowed, thus evidently confounding the post hoc with the propter hoc. A very few quotations will be sufficient to establish this.

Take, for example, Cayenne pepper, a valuable condiment, with the action of which, on the healthy body, we are tolerably familiar.

Our readers will be surprised to hear, that it produces in homoeopathists 142 different symptoms, of which the following may serve as a specimen,—Pains, with stiffness of the joints—cramps in the body—disposition to be frightened—strong disposition to take every thing in bad part, to fly into a rage, even on account of pleasantries, and to utter reproaches—WANT OF REFLECTION AND AWKWARDNESS (how truly

* Black, p. 61.

homoeopathic!)—disposition to jest, and utter witticisms—bewilderment of the head—intoxication, as if from spirituous liquors—loss of memory—SIGHT ENTIRELY EXTINGUISHED, AS IF FROM AMAUROSIS (palsy of the eye-nerve)—painful swelling behind the ear—epistaxis—burning pain in the stomach and epigastrium, especially after taking a meal—aqueous and insipid taste—flatulent colic—cough after taking coffee—dysentery—oppressed respiration—shooting in the chest—pain in the roots of the hair, *after scratching*.*

One example more and we have done. We select common charcoal—*carbo vegetabilis*—and this time, we shall quote from Hahnemann himself, regretting, only, that the work from which we make our selection (chronic diseases), is so obscene, as to preclude the possibility of our giving any thing like a full extract from it.

Common charcoal is not regarded by allopathic practitioners as an agent possessing any great power. Burdin gave a pound of it daily, without producing any physiological effect, and Hahnemann informs us, that *physicians* did not believe it possessed *any* medicinal properties at all. With admirable naïveté, however, he observes, that it was left for *empiricism* to discover its virtues; but there was a difference between the empiric discoverer and his homoeopathic follower. The

* Jahr, Op. Cit. vol. i. p. 127, et seq.

one used the wood of the lime tree and the other that of the birch. But did we say that this ingredient is powerless? Impossible! For Hahnemann discovered, that by triturating it with a non-medicinal substance, such as sugar of milk, and dosing a healthy person with the decillionth of a grain, he could produce no fewer than 930 distinct symptoms! For a considerable time he gave it in the sextillionth dilution, but long experience (for the remedy seems a favourite) convinced him, that the decillionth is the most effective. How dreadful to think of the quantity that must be swallowed by those who brush their teeth with it, and the sufferings to which they must therefore be exposed.

Before reviewing the effects of this most powerful agent, let us remark, that in the homoeopathic experiments, although certain restrictions as to diet are prescribed, yet the experimenter is allowed "young peas, French beans, and even carrots, as being the green vegetables that have the fewest medicinal properties."—Nov. Org. p. 204.

Again, "The drink is to be similar to what the experimenter has been accustomed to," with a hint, that it "should be as little stimulant as possible." (Ibid.) We shall find, that it is of importance to determine, in this particular case, what was the exact quantity swallowed.

But, inasmuch as there is no precise information on the subject, we might be left to mere conjec-

ture, were it not that we find one experimenter had before “suffered from a broken head;” (§ 49–90.) He had found, too, that a *little* wine, taken during the experiments, had the effect of heating him; and as Hahnemann particularly cautions experimenters to avoid this, we presume he took more to counteract its effect, on homoeopathic principles; for

“Here shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
So drinking largely sobers it again.”

Be this as it may, the peculiar symptoms *of the medicine* (?) began to be manifest on rising from table (§ 61.), and “acquired an additional intensity after supper,” (§ 35.)

We shall give a selection from the symptoms; and as Black admits that Hahnemann has an awkward trick of not enumerating them in the order in which they are manifested, we shall give them what we think is a more natural arrangement.

Behold our experimenter then! After having taken his prescribed diet, in no insignificant quantity, we presume, for he lays such stress upon the *moderate* proportions of a subsequent meal, that it seems very obvious the thing was of rare occurrence with him,—and having finished his labours, with his *usual* allowance of wine, which we have reason to suppose was not out of proportion to the food, and having swallowed in addition (we entreat pardon for leaving it to the

last) *the decillionth part of one grain of vegetable charcoal*, his observations are recorded as follows:—

1st, “Giddiness either in walking or in sitting down”—then “a loss of sense and memory”—“he falls asleep on his chair”—“awakes still giddy, with a trembling of the body, and on trying to rise, feels as if fainting”—“the slightest movement makes him giddy”—“he tries to walk, but *reels*,” and “at last is obliged to go to bed”—when there, however, he does not sleep, but feels it impossible to open his eyes.”—Observations, 7, 14, 16, 11, 2, 7.

Next morning, “he has a sensation in the mouth and on the tongue, as if he had been drinking much wine the night before”—“in rising from bed, his head is very much carried”—“he has difficulty in combining his thoughts”—“he is as one awakened from a dream”—“is obliged to go to bed again;” but remembering the real cause, he confesses “that he has a headache, with stupefaction, *as if after a debauch*”—“he is unable to take breakfast”—“his tongue is white and loaded”—“his mouth is dry”—“his lips tremble convulsively”—“he has a violent beating pain in the head”—“acid eructations”—“nausea, and pain in the stomach,” “with frequent desire to vomit.”—Observations, 236, 19, 23, 247, 226, 228, 167, 59, 256, 284, 286.

So admirable is this description of the expe-

rience of a drunkard, that we almost hesitate whether to prefer the confessions of Hahnemann's experimenters, or the celebrated sketch of Christopher North.* The one might be a translation of the other. In proof of this we give the annexed comparison.

*Description of a Drunkard,
by Christopher North.**

"Drunkard, stand forward, that we may draw your picture. There he stands! The mouth of the drunkard, you may observe, contracts a singularly sensitive appearance. Seemingly red and rawish."

"He is perpetually licking or smacking his lips, as if his palate were dry, or adust.

"His whole being burns for a dram."

"What a snout he turns up to the mountain air,—inflamed, pimpled, snubby, and snorty."

*Symptoms produced by
Charcoal, according
to Hahnemann.†*

"Gonflement de la lèvre supérieure, et de la joue avec douleur convulsive;" § 184.

"Le bout de la langue est chaud et sec." § 228. "Chaleur dans la bouche et sécheresse;" § 273.

"Ardeur en haut dans la gorge;" § 238. "Sensation d'ardeur en arrière, et en haut dans la gorge;" § 240.

"Eruption de nombreux boutons à la face;" § 139. "Sur le front çà et là éruption de boutons rouges lisses et indolens;" § 101. "Eruption dans le coin de l'aile du nez;" § 183.

* Recreations, vol. i.

† On Chronic Diseases, vol. i.

“ And with a nob at the end on’t, like one carved out of a stick by the knife of a schoolboy.”

“ A perpetual cough harasses, and a perpetual expectoration exhausts him.”

“ How his hand trembles !”

“ It is an effort even to sign his name.”

“ One of his sides is certainly not so sound as the other, there has been a touch of palsy there.”

“ And the next hint will draw down his chin to his collar bone.”

“ And convert him a month before dissolution into a slaving idiot.”

“ Croûtes au bout du nez ;” § 184.

“ Prurit dans le larynx qui excite à tousser, avec expectoration visqueuse, salée ;” § 534. “ Crachats muqueux tirés du larynx par une toux brève ;” § 554.

“ Sensation dans le mains, comme si la force musculaire y était affaiblie ;” § 688.

“ On écrit lentement et avec difficulté ;” § 689.

“ Tressaillement musculaire dans le côté gauche ;” § 625.

“ Faiblesse, *comme paralytique* de l’épaule et du bras droit ;” § 641.

“ Douleur spasmodique à la machoire inférieure ;” § 190. “ Douleurs déchirantes dans les muscles du côté gauche de la nuque ;” § 646.

“ Augmentation de la sécrétion salivaire ;” § 232.

“ Manque subit de mémoire ; on ne se souvient pas de ce qu’on vient de dire ou d’entendre ;” § 15. Difficulté de parler, comme si on avait de la peine à remuer la langue ;” § 230.

“ There is no occupation, small or great, insignificant or important, to which he can turn, for any length of time, his hand, his heart, or his head.” “ Paresse, somnolence, inaptitude a tout ;” § 842. “ Inaptitude aux efforts corporels ;” § 823. “ Paresse d’esprit, inaptitude à penser ;” § 914.

So much, *we* should say, for the wine. But are the green peas, the French beans, and the carrots idle, all free from medicinal properties though they be ?

It might be disputed, whether the acid eructations were due to them or to the wine, were it not that homoeopathy has decided that they were the effect of the charcoal. We have, however, “ colic ” — “ flatulent distension of the stomach ” — “ griping pains, occasioned by flatulence, confined in the left part of the stomach ; ” — confined, however, it did not long remain, for soon we have “ eructations et emissions de vents, &c.” *

We are compelled to draw a veil over what follows ; suffice it to say, that the orgies of the night seem to have been not unworthy of the Bacchanalian revelries which ushered them in. Was it wonderful if they should be followed by “ bad humour, a kind of oppression,” “ an excessive irritability, an impatience or despair,” a combination strongly savouring of “ blue devils,” and leading us to believe, that the headach was not

* Observations, 334, 319, 343, 319, 357.

the only symptom of which it might be said, "comme après l'ivresse." *

There are a class of symptoms recorded, of which we have given no specimen, and from the perusal of which we were compelled to desist, on account of their abominable character. What we have quoted, seemed to have been caused partly by the wine, partly by the diet; *these* were of a class which cannot be explained by either, and are to be accounted for, not by the swallowing of the decillionth of a grain of charcoal, but by the stimulants taken, acting on the mind of an immoral, filthy, and licentious scoundrel.

And, upon such observations as these, a science is to be founded!

Because the decillionth of a grain of charcoal, swallowed along with wine, and a diet consisting partly of green vegetables, is followed by symptoms such as those we have described, therefore, conclude these modern philosophers, it is a "specific in the complaints which follow a debauch." †

Because the stomach symptoms we have recorded, and others of a similar kind occurred, it is set down as a remedy for "continual nausea, loss of appetite, fulness and oppression of the stomach after eating." ‡

Because the experimenter, after taking it, was

* X. Ibid, 906, 910, 917, 920.

† Chron. Disease, vol. ii. p. 298.

‡ Ibid. p. 299.

affected with a cold of the head, and complained of “frequent sneezing, with watering of the left eye; itching in the right nostril, with a flow of mucus; cold in the head and chest; hoarseness, and considerable difficulty of breathing; thickness and roughness of the voice; frequent attacks of short cough;” * it is concluded, that these were caused by the infinitesimal dose of charcoal, and that, therefore, it is entitled to rank as “a *specific* in the cough and sore throat of measles.” †

Again, we have “a tight tearing pain in the left side of the chest”—“a compressive rheumatismal pain in the right side, under the false ribs”—“starting pains, with constriction in the region of the heart, which disappear after a gurgling in the left side”—“on lying down, acute shooting pains across the chest, which prevent free respiration; acute burning feeling in the chest, *as if from an internal charcoal fire.* ‡ The decillionth grain has ignited now. Mark its effect—something is made to boil. “Hot boiling in the chest.”§ The patient gets anxious, not about this, but its effect; for now we have “Anxiety from an accumulation of wind” (steam?) “in the intestinal canal;” and so the whole affair ends in vapour.

Symptoms such as these, are undoubtedly the

* Observations, 514, 531, 506, 331, 517, 536.

† Op. cit. p. 298.

‡ Obs. 557, 335, 568, 336, 570.

§ Ibid. 578, p. 336.

result of the charcoal, and "entitle it to rank as a remedy for water in the chest." * This is not absolutely unintelligible. What could have "ignited," but the charcoal? What "boiled," but the water? The remedy converted it into steam, and thus it was expelled.

No wonder that such a cure causes "liberté d'esprit, légèreté et sentiment general de bien être."

But, seriously, would any sane man be content to rest his hope of cure, in a formidable complaint like water in the chest, on the virtues of a medicine so inert, given in such doses, and with no better evidence of its power? or, is any doctor justified, in taking, as a "field for" *such* "experiments, an unfortunate patient," afflicted with such a disease? We have no objection to the sufferer, from a debauch overnight, getting rid of its effects by these *potent* remedies; although, by the bye, as "homoeopathic cures are effected by powers not identical, but only analogous," we are at a loss to understand how, even on the homoeopaths' own showing, it should have any effect as a remedy for intoxication. But is it not scandalous, in a serious disease, so shamelessly to tamper with human life?

We have not selected these experiments on charcoal, on account of any *peculiar* absurdity in

* Op. Cit. p. 293.

them; there are others equally ridiculous, some even more immoral, and yet these are the experiments on which Dr. Black is willing to stake the credit of homoeopathy,—“the purest, the best he can adduce.” “The purest proofs, those best ascertained, and those to which Hahnemann and his school appeal, are the numerous experiments performed by himself and his followers,” (p. 46).

Surely we may now assert, that the “purest and best ascertained” facts on which homoeopathy rests, fall far short of the standard required, and can never be regarded as those “definite and certain facts, free from obscurity *and doubt*, which can alone form the foundation of scientific induction.”

3d, These observations are not entitled to the slightest confidence, because it is the custom of the homoeopathists to record, as symptoms *produced* by their medicines, the symptoms of all those diseases which have been *removed* by the employment of the substances in the hands of allopathic practitioners; though such symptoms never appeared in healthy persons on whom the remedies were tried. Had we not this on the confession of homoeopathists themselves, it were next to impossible to believe, that they could expect to establish their system by means of a trick so palpable.

Hahnemann tells us, “that the curative power of medicines, is founded upon the property

which they possess of creating symptoms, similar to those of the disease itself," and this is the *law* on which homoeopathy rests.

To prove it, homoeopaths class, among the "symptoms created by each medicine," the symptoms of all those diseases which, in the hands of allopathists, it has been known to *cure*, so that their method of proof is truly sufficiently simple.

Speaking of the sources of the *materia medica*, Dr. Black observes, after mentioning two means by which a knowledge of the symptoms, which their remedies produce on a healthy person, is arrived at. "*Third*, The results of the successful treatment of disease by simple remedies, which are generally styled specific, such as the cure of goitre by burnt sponge or iodine, WHICH DISEASE HAS BEEN CLASSED IN THE MATERIA MEDICA AS ONE OF THE SYMPTOMS PRODUCED BY IODINE."

We might search far for another example, as flagrant as this, of reasoning in a circle.

Homoeopathic medicines are said to cure disease, because they produce symptoms similar to it in a healthy person, and with regard to many of them, the only proof that they do produce such symptoms, is, that they cure similar diseases.

With such a procedure as this, what absurdity might not be established?

4th, These observations are not entitled to the slightest confidence, because, when repeated

by those unprejudiced, they have not produced the same effects.

To take one example, belladonna is said not only to cure, but to prevent scarlet fever; because it produces such symptoms "as redness of the whole body, shiverings, fever, inflammation, and swelling of the throat, of the velum palati, of the uvula, and the tonsils." Such effects are said to have followed its use, when taken by the homoeopaths, but when others than the disciples of this system swallow the same substance, no such effects are seen. Thus, M. Stivenart gave it to 400 healthy individuals, varying the dose from the fourth to the twentieth of a grain, according to the age. In not one of these was any appearance of sore throat, resembling that of scarlatina, produced, and only five were affected with a rash, which also was very different from the scarlatinic eruption, and probably had as little to do with the belladonna.* In 150 soldiers, who were poisoned by this substance near Dresden, and whose symptoms are minutely reported by Gualtier de Claubry, not a single symptom, bearing any resemblance to scarlet fever appeared.†

So much for the value of the *facts* from which homoeopathy starts. Our examination of them has certainly not tended to elevate our ideas of

* Bulletin de l'Academie Royale de Med., tome viii. No. 9.

† Orfila on Poisons.

this quasi-science, but has convinced us of the justice of the remark of Pascal,—“ Les hommes ne se trompent pas tant parce qu'ils raisonnent mal que parce qu'ils raisonnent en consequence de principes faux.” We shall see immediately, however, that their reasoning is as defective as the facts on which it is founded, and that the homoeopaths have not even the merit of arguing well from false premises. It is true, that in strict logical order, we should next endeavour to estimate the value of that other class of *facts*, which assume that diseases are actually cured by homoeopathic treatment. The discussion of this we shall leave, however, till we come to investigate its value as a mere art, when such considerations will find an appropriate place; and, in the mean time, we allow the homoeopaths all the advantage which their argument can derive from admitting them to be true.

CHAPTER III.

Even were the Homoeopathic Facts admitted, the Law is not Proved—Homoeopaths do not Practice by their own Law, but change from Homoeopathy to Allopathy as suits their purpose—They have mistaken Apparent for Real Analogies, and founded their whole System on these.—They do not treat Disease but its Symptoms, mistaking the shadow for the substance.—They regard Disease as Cured when the Symptoms have temporarily disappeared, and, in consequence, often find Patients, whom they have regarded as Cured, return with an aggravation of their Symptoms.

Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἵπποισι κελητίζειν εὔ εἰδώς,
 Ὅσ' ἐπὶ ἐκ πολλῶν πίσυρας συναγείρεται ἵππους,
 Σείας ἐκ πεδίοιο μέγα προτὶ ἄστυ διώκει,
 Λαοφόρον καθ' ὁδὸν, πολέες τέ εἰ θηήσαντο
 Ἀνέρες, ἥδ' ἐ γυναικες· ὃ δ' ἔμπεδον ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 Θρώσκων ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἀμείβεσθαι· οἳ δὲ πέτονται.

ILIAD, LIB. XV.

*So when a horseman from the watery mead,
 (Skill'd in the manage of the bounding steed),
 Drives four fair coursers, practised to obey,
 To some great city, through the public way;
 Safe in his art, as side by side they run,
 He shifts his seat, and vaults from one to one;
 And now to this and now to that he flies;
 Admiring numbers follow with their eyes.*

POPE'S TRANSLATION.

Thou art neither fish nor flesh—a man cannot tell where to have thee.
HENRY IV.

THE inductive process demands, that the link which connects the facts from which it starts, and those at which it arrives, should be as clear

and indubitable as the facts themselves. Having already shown the fallacious character of the one class of alleged homoeopathic facts, we now proceed to consider the mental conception by which they are supposed to be placed in a definite relation to one another, and which constitutes the reasoning on which the homoeopathic law is founded.

If homoeopathic medicines do really produce certain symptoms in the healthy subject, and do really cure diseases presenting symptoms analogous to these, do these two powers bear any relation to each other, and does that relation warrant us in concluding, that wherever we find that a substance has power to produce a certain class of symptoms, it will act specifically on diseases exhibiting similar ones? Here, be it observed, we admit, for argument's sake, that the substance really does produce the symptoms, and cure the disease, and we shall discuss the inference supposed to be drawn from this, as if it connected acknowledged facts, thus giving the homoeopaths every advantage they can desire, and much more than they have any title to claim.

It is evident, that to prove their law, the homoeopaths must either show *why* it *must* be true, or exhibit such an extensive series of facts, *explicable on no other principle*, as shall clearly show that it *is* so. But does homoeopathy do this? On the contrary, Dr. Black admits,—

“Such are the” (three) “principal explanations of the rationale of our principle, the two former erroneous, the latter, perhaps imperfect; but, until we arrive at a more intimate knowledge of vital laws, we can scarcely hope to explain more satisfactorily the law, *similia similibus curantur*,” p. 55—so that the first ground of proof is abandoned. In discussing the second, we shall do all possible justice to the homoeopaths, and shall not demand from them any higher proof than Hahnemann himself professes to regard as essential, viz.:—“That it (*i. e.* the homoeopathic law) should clearly manifest itself in every accurate experiment and research;” Nov. Org. Aph. 23.

We have already shown * that it does not; and shall here briefly recapitulate some proofs already given, and adduce a few in addition.

1st, In cases of syncope, does the law manifest itself, and can they be treated homoeopathically? No! for “in them it is necessary to have recourse to stimuli,—stimuli which cannot be afforded by homoeopathic medicine,” p. 163.

2d, In cases where life seems almost extinguished, does the law manifest itself, and can they be treated homoeopathically? No! for in these “the ordinary measures must be employed to excite reaction,” p. 164.

3d, When offending matter exists in the sto-

* See p. 29, et seq.

mach and intestinal canal, does the law manifest itself, and can it be removed by homoeopathic means? No! for in these "the first step is to get rid of them by means of an emetic or gentle aperient, such as castor oil," p. 164.

4th, In individuals who have long laboured under constipation, does the law manifest itself, and will homoeopathic treatment avail? No! for in such cases "an enema of tepid water may be occasionally employed," p. 165.

5th, In syphilis, does the law manifest itself, and is it to be treated homoeopathically? No! for, says Black, "Hahnemann's opinion we consider to be erroneous, and opposed to many careful experiments," p. 115; "and by abandoning it in this instance, the danger of overlooking and increasing the general disease is avoided, and allopathic remedies will, in many cases, succeed completely in preventing the constitution being tainted with the virus, an end much more desirable, than an opportunity of manifesting the beneficial results of specific (*i. e. homoeopathic*) treatment," p. 118.*

6th, In chronic diseases, does the law manifest itself, and can they be treated homoeopathically? No! for Hahnemann observed, "after twelve years of diligent research, that chronic diseases,

* Surely the treatment which *really* manifests beneficial results, is *always* the most desirable!

treated homoeopathically, even in the best manner, reappeared, after having been frequently seemingly cured, and, each year, with a perceptible increase in their intensity;" B. p. 109.

Indeed, to treat this large class of diseases, a new law, altogether different from *the* homoeopathic one, has been invented; for the homoeopathic law is, that diseases are to be treated by remedies which produce symptoms similar to them in a healthy person; yet Hahnemann asserts, that in chronic diseases, remedies are to be directed, not against symptoms which really exist, but against the symptoms of one or other of three imaginary diseases, itch, syphilis, and syphilis, which were *supposed to have existed* at some previous time! "Even in cases where the patient did not recollect having had the itch, still his complaint was attributable to scabies, which he had forgotten, or which had been driven in while he was an infant;" B. p. 110.

It thus appears, that all who profess to have been cured of *any* chronic disease by homoeopathy, virtually plead guilty to having been infected with one or other of these disorders. Let them select their favourite!

It appears further, that all diseases which refuse to yield to the "best homoeopathic treatment," are forthwith honoured with this high, though imaginary descent; so that the class is large enough, comprehending "not only the

greater part of the innumerable diseases of the skin, which have been distinguished and denominated so minutely by Willan, but also all the pseudo organizations, from the wart upon the finger, to the enlargement of bones, to the deviations of the vertebral column, and to many other distortions and softenings of bones in infancy and adult age; that the frequent epistaxis, the congestions of the hæmorrhoidal veins, hæmoptysis, hæmatemesis, and hæmaturia, amenorrhœa, menorrhagia, habitual nocturnal sweats, dryness of the skin, habitual diarrhœa, obstinate constipation, chronic erratic pains, convulsions appearing during many consecutive years; in a word, the thousand chronic affections to which pathology assigns different names, are only, with few exceptions, the effects of a polymorphous psora," (multiform itch). (Hahnemann, quoted by Black, p. 111.)

Nor does it affect our argument in the slightest degree, whether the followers of Hahnemann adopt the itch hypothesis or not. They all practise by its rules, and therefore, in this large class of diseases, they sacrifice that law of Hahnemann's, which they profess to believe true, for practical rules deduced from another, by which the homoeopathic law, which *alone* enabled them to practise conscientiously, is continually violated!

Dr. Black seems aware of the awkward way in which the "itch hypothesis" cushions the law

of homoeopathy; and thinking it best to look the dilemma fairly in the face, with more boldness than discretion, he asserts, that “it has caused no schism whatever in the practical application of the homoeopathic law.” It is plain, that either Hahnemann or Black must be mistaken; for if, as Hahnemann says, previously to inventing the itch hypothesis, he failed to cure chronic diseases permanently, *even by the best homoeopathic treatment*, then, after he had invented that hypothesis, he either treated homoeopathically, or he did not. If he did, he must have employed means *worse* than the best, and succeeded with them after the best had failed, which is a contradiction; and if he did not, it is plain that homoeopathy failed to cure a class of diseases, comprehending a large majority of those we daily meet with, and that a *new* theory, with a corresponding practice, had to be *invented*, to meet the exigencies of this class of cases.

Thus it is plain, that chronic diseases do not manifest the operation of the law, and are not to be treated homoeopathically.

7th, In epidemic diseases, does the law manifest itself? No! because “the entire extent of an affection of this nature, together with the totality of the symptoms (a knowledge of which is necessary to form a complete image of the morbid state, and to choose, according to that, the homoeopathic remedy most in harmony with the *ensemble* of the symp-

toms), cannot be observed in the case of a single patient.”* (Hahnemann, quoted by Black, p. 135).

8th, In local diseases, does the law manifest itself? Not entirely! for often, after “the best homoeopathic treatment,” the disease will be found not to be wholly removed; and then we are directed, merely, be it observed, on account of its obstinate resistance of homoeopathic treatment, “to direct an appropriate anti-itch treatment against the symptoms which remain;” B. p. 139; so that they direct against the existing disease, a remedy which has no power to produce symptoms similar to *it*, but which is supposed to be the specific in itch, under which the patient is *not* labouring!

Such, then, are the diseases in which homoeopathic treatment is to be departed from; and, when we consider the large proportion they bear to all known diseases—to use the words of Dr. Black:—

“The question will suggest itself to many, Can there be an alliance between allopathy and homoeopathy?” B. p. 162. Let our author himself reply, “That a combination of the two cannot be practised with success;” B. p. 163.

But even were it proved, that the large number of cases, which, on the admission of homoeopaths themselves, cannot be treated by their

* See note, p. 40.

method, are really curable by it, Is the homoeopathic law the only way in which such cures can be explained? On the contrary, there are other explanations at least *equally* satisfactory. For example:—Long experience has retained three out of the numerous class of medicines supposed to be specific—bark in ague, vaccination in smallpox, and lemon juice in scurvy. As the homoeopathists profess the object of their law to be, the discovery of specifics, we naturally expect, that of all medicines, the action of *these* should be capable of explanation on homoeopathic principles. But is it so? Bark, we have already shown to be an exception to the homoeopathic law, although it is the professed foundation of it. The action of vaccination is not only inexplicable by it, but is the result of the operation of another law. We have never heard even homoeopathists pretend, that lemon juice has the power of producing scurvy in a healthy person. But as the action of vaccination has been so often adduced by homoeopathists as a proof of their law, we think it necessary to consider its *modus operandi* in detail. “Homoeopathic cures are effected by powers not *identical*, but only *analogous*,” p. 47. Mark! “*only* analogous,” yet Dr. Black has collected proofs sufficiently strong (although he might have adduced some even stronger), to show that cowpox and smallpox *are identical*. And it will not do to say, “that though cowpox may be produced from

smallpox, it becomes modified by the channels through which it passes, so that it still cures homoeopathically," p. 47; for what *analogy*, we ask, is there between smallpox and cowpox? The one is a pustular, the other a vesicular disease; the one is a general, the other a local affection; the one is attended with severe constitutional symptoms, the other exhibits none of these. The one is complicated with affections of the internal mucous membranes; the action of the other is confined to the skin, and instead of being general over *it*, is limited to the small point where the virus was inserted.

What are the proofs given by homoeopaths of the analogy? * 1st, These diseases "generally appear but once during the course of a person's life." This is applicable to a large class of diseases, between which no analogy is pretended; besides, it is not the case as respects vaccination, which will often reappear when the exciting cause is reapplied. †

* Black, p. 225.

† A general revaccination of the Prussian army, having been ordered in the year 1834, the results were published in an official document, addressed by the head of the military medical department, Von Wiebel, to the medical officers in the army, and dated Berlin, 23d June, 1835.

1. The number of men vaccinated was	.	.	44,454
2. Of this number,—			
Had distinct marks of previous vaccination	.		33,634
Indistinct marks	.	.	7,134
No marks	.	.	3,686

But, 2*d*, According to the homoeopaths, smallpox and cowpox are identical, “because they leave behind cicatrices equally deep.” A sound foundation for an analogy truly! If we could bring forward fifty cases, to show that the cicatrices left in the two diseases are not equally deep, would the homoeopaths admit that this disproved their analogy? Are the cicatrices equally deep in all cases of smallpox, or in all cases of cowpox? If the character of the cicatrix tells one way or another, it is against the analogy; for had the homoeopaths better studied pathology, they

3. The present vaccination was,—

Regular in its course in	16,679
Irregular	12,287
Without any result	15,488

4. Of the number in whom the vaccination failed, (15,488) 4,530 were revaccinated a second time; and, of these, 866 took the disease, while in the remaining 3,664, no effect was produced.*

In the year 1836, another general revaccination of the army took place, with the following results:—

1. The number of men revaccinated was . . . 42,124

2. Of this number,—

Had distinct marks of previous vaccination	32,635
Indistinct	6,645
No marks	2,844

3. The present vaccination was,—

Regular in its course in	18,136
Irregular in	9,940
Without any result	14,048

4. Of the number in whom vaccination failed (14,048), it proved successful, on repetition, in 1,569, remaining abortive in 12,479.†

* Rust's Magazin, Band xiv. Heft. 1., and Brit. and For. Med. Rev. No. ii.

† Medicinische Zeitung, 1837, No. 20 and 21.

would have known, that the cicatrix of cowpox is one of a very peculiar character, totally unlike that produced by smallpox, or any other disease.

3d, " They both occasion tumefaction of the axillary glands." Because they are both poisons, and every poison carried along the absorbents may produce the same effect ; as, for example, the scratch of a rusty nail.

4th, " They both produce a fever that is analogous." Will the homoeopaths describe the peculiar character of the fever, analogous to that of smallpox, by which vaccination is attended ?

5th, " They both present an inflamed areola round each part." Of course they do ; but, unfortunately, this is found in all vesicular and pustular diseases ; and surely the homoeopaths do not pretend that they are *all* analogous to smallpox.

6th, " And, finally, they both produce ophthalmia and convulsions." Indeed ! What prodigious risks, then, must be run by children, under this same formidable vaccination. We might appeal to the mothers of Britain, as to the inaccuracy of this last assertion. Would the homoeopaths be content, that all their other assertions should be regarded as analogous in truth to this one ? Were it so, a juster estimate would, we believe, be formed of the character of homoeopathy.

Thus, there is not one single point on which an analogy can be founded, and yet, however unlike

the *symptoms* may be, the *essence* of the two diseases is, as Dr. Black states, *identical*; so that this, the most valuable of all specifics, never could have been discovered by the homoeopathic law, which Dr. Black says—"Explains, not only all known specifics, but is also a certain fact, which will lead inevitably to the discovery of specifics hitherto unknown," p. 45.

Our argument only requires us to prove, that the homoeopathic law does not explain the action of vaccination; but we will go a step farther, and show that it is explicable on other principles. Smallpox usually occurs in every individual once, and once only in the course of his life; and though there are exceptions to this, as well as to the protective power of vaccination, yet to quote one of the highest authorities on this subject, "its general accuracy is unquestionable, at least so far as the constitution of the human body allows us to acknowledge any such widely extended proposition."* So that we may assume, that in virtue of this law, an individual having had cowpox, is entitled to expect immunity from smallpox in the same way, although perhaps not to the same extent, as having had the latter disease once, might secure him from any future attack.

Those cases, too, which Dr. Black quotes as cured by homoeopathic remedies, accidentally

* Gregory, Practice of Physic, p. 100.

stumbled on by allopathic practitioners, admit equally of other explanations. Most of these remedies are powerful stimulants of some particular tissue, and thus modify its state sufficiently to produce disease in it when sound, or stimulate it to throw off disease when morbidly affected; and the only analogy between the symptoms it produces, and the symptoms of the diseases it cures, is merely in their occurring in the same tissue. Take sulphur, for example. Its undoubted efficacy in itch, has led us to regard it as almost specific in that affection; yet it has no power to produce itch in a healthy subject; and the only analogy between the affections it causes and cures, are, that they are both seated in the skin; but we find, that "sulphur is a stimulant to the secreting organs, especially to the skin,"* which accounts for its power to modify the action of that tissue, both in health and disease; in the one case producing, in the other curing, cutaneous affections. We do not positively assert, that this is the correct explanation, but it is *at least* as probable as the homoeopathic, and derives additional confirmation from the fact, that all the remedies cited from allopathic authorities, as producing homoeopathic cures, act powerfully on certain tissues of the body. How completely does that plausibility, with which, as we have already

* Pereira, Mat. Med. vol. i. p. 258.

remarked, Hahnemann has contrived to invest homoeopathy, vanish, as we push our examinations into its real character! Nor is it difficult to see why this is the case; our readers must have already observed, that any appearance of truth which it had, was derived from analogy, "which, as it can only afford probable evidence at the best; so, unless great caution be used, we are apt to be led into error by it."* The symptoms bark produces in a healthy person are "*analogous*" to those of intermittent fever. All diseases are cured by remedies producing "*analogous*" symptoms in a healthy person. "But all arguments, drawn from analogy, are still the weaker, the greater disparity there is between the things compared;"† therefore, as we have shown how little similitude there *really* is, in the things between which homoeopaths imagine they find analogies; so in the same proportion must we have lessened the degree of probability of the conclusions drawn from such analogies.

But the same reckless use of analogies pervades the whole system of homoeopathy. The law, "*similia similibus curantur*," ought certainly to mean, that the remedy produces effects similar to the disease. It seems, however, that this is not what is meant, for, when we search more

* Reid, Powers of Human Mind, vol. i. p. 79.

† Ibid, p. 80

minutely into the system, we find that it is *symptoms*, similar to the *symptoms* of disease, which are alleged to be produced; and to give an appearance of plausibility to such a cure, it is asserted that the symptoms of a disease are all that the physician has to do with,—all that he is called on to remove.

As this is a point which has led to much discussion, and as Dr. Black complains, that the views of the homoeopathists on the subject have been often misconceived, we shall consider it more fully than might otherwise have been necessary.

Hahnemann regards disease “as an operation of the vital power departed from its natural condition;” (Black, p. 91.) This doctrine, however erroneous, is not peculiar to Hahnemann, but was held by the whole Stahlian school; which explains the support that homoeopathy has received from Hufeland, who, advocating similar views, regards disease, not as an affection—an organic, or material lesion, but as a reaction of some unknown principle against a morbid cause.* Similar views, long ago introduced into medicine so many hypothetical existences—as, the disturbed elements of Plato—the saline reaction of Silvius—the spasm of extreme vessels of Cullen—the vital force—the *vis medicatrix naturæ*—and innu-

* Enchiridion, Trad. de Jourdan, p. 60.

merable other embodiments of visionary theories. It is plain, that the whole doctrine rests on a series of gratuitous assumptions and vague assertions, and, as Piorry has well remarked, “has been, in general, proposed or supported by men, who, for the most part, have bestowed little attention on anatomy, or the observation of disease, but who, *like many of the Germans*, have devoted themselves especially to bibliographical or dogmatical studies.” * It is a doctrine, therefore, very likely to have found favour with the supporters of homoeopathy, who, in this country at least, are chiefly young men, and who, apparently, have not devoted themselves with much assiduity to the study of the real character of disease, as embraced in the science of pathology. † Nor are opinions of this kind merely speculative. It is plain that they must, in many cases, lead to great inactivity in practice—an inactivity peculiarly well suited to the infinitesimal dose system. It does not affect our argument, whether Hahnemann was the inventor, or only the maintainer of this doctrine. If it be erroneous, his practice must be affected by it—however,

* Pathologie, p. 8.

† The followers of Hahnemann, who so “strongly condemn pathology,” are not likely to consider this as casting any reflection on their professional acquirements. If they do so, let them remember, that more than one of their number consider spitting of blood as unconnected with consumption; (Black, p. 147.) Ignorance for which the merest tyro in medicine would blush.

it may be satisfactory to his followers to ascertain, that, in this instance, he has blundered through imitation, rather than through invention.

Hahnemann seems to have entertained the belief, that the final cause of disease being unknown, we ought to go no farther than its external manifestations, and direct our treatment, not against the disease, but the symptoms. "In his own words, the 'totality of the symptoms' is the principal, or the only thing, which should engage the attention of the physician in every affection; the only thing which he has to combat by the power of his art, to effect a cure and re-establish health."—(Nov. Org. p. 115.) Celsus has well observed, that the symptoms stand in the same relation to the disease, as the shadow does to the substance, but the homoeopathists have been the first to avow that, like the dog in the fable, they have dropped the latter only to catch at the former. No wonder that Hahnemann, if such are his views, "too strongly condemned pathology;" had he studied it, he would have obtained the best corrective of his vague, fanciful, and erroneous conjectures.

How differently does Laennec, a real prodigy of learning and philosophy, speak on the same subject,—"I think," he observes, "that the study of the anatomical varieties of disease is the only basis of positive knowledge in medicine, of which we can never lose sight without pursuing

chimeras, and creating phantoms for attack. But I also think, that it is equally dangerous to bestow on the local changes, an attention so exclusive, as to cause us to lose sight of the difference of the causes on which they depend, or, if possible, on their known or hidden essence. This short-sighted way of regarding disease, leads us often to confound the effect with its cause, and to fall into the grave error of regarding and treating as identical, diseases in which the only alterations visible, are lesions anatomically similar."

Hahnemann tells us farther, that the *symptoms* of disease, being all which we can recognise by our senses, are all we should attempt to cure; the allopathic school, on the other hand, endeavours from the symptoms, to arrive at a knowledge of the morbid state on which they depend, and against this to direct appropriate remedies. This is done by the examination of structural and functional changes, and the practical application of the whole science of pathology, "to which," Dr. Black informs us, "the followers of Hahnemann do not attach the extreme importance that it possesses in the eyes of the allopathic school," p. 95. The following passage expresses well the method pursued by the allopathic physician, to determine on the particular manner in which he is to treat any given disease:—

"When, by an attentive examination of his patient, the physician has recognised the nature

of the disease with which he is affected—its particular character—its progress—its natural tendency towards a favourable or unfavourable termination—the causes from which it has originated—its influence on the constitution, &c., &c.,—this group of circumstances points out the method of treatment which we ought to follow, and seems to *indicate* our plan, whence we derive the word *indication*.”*

Dr. Black has attempted to prove, that Hahnemann meant to include under “totality of symptoms,” the changes in structure on which the symptoms depend, and complains, that “great misconception has arisen from the undue consideration of the term “totality of the symptoms,” p. 94. A very careful study of that part of Hahnemann’s work has convinced us, that Dr. Black does not fairly represent his views on this subject.

After stating that disease consists of two parts, “the invisible substance which has undergone a morbid alteration in the interior of the body, and the perceptible change which shows itself externally in the general state of the organism—the totality of the symptoms.” Hahnemann goes on to say, “but the totality of the symptoms is the only part of this disease which is accessible to the physician, the only one of which he can

* Chomel Pathologic, p. 619.

acquire an intuitive notion, and the principal one which it is necessary to know, in order to effect a cure,"—Aph. vi. Can any thing be plainer than this, and yet, Dr. Black wishes us to believe, that under totality of symptoms, Hahnemann meant to include internal morbid changes, not perceptible to our senses, but discovered (*i. e.* inferred) by the skill of the physician. As Hahnemann has admitted only two divisions of disease, the internal structural changes must be classed by him, either under "the invisible changes in the interior," or "the perceptible symptoms at the exterior:" if, under the former, then they do not belong to the totality of the symptoms; and, according to the homoeopathic belief, "would it not, therefore, be madness to propose them as the object of cure?"* If, under the latter, then we frankly admit, that Hahnemann is right in principle, though he has grievously mis-used language. But he expressly says, that "the totality of symptoms is *perceptible*;" that is, in the ordinary meaning of language—objective to our senses; and, indeed, the very word symptom implies something cognizable by our senses; but the internal structural changes are not so, their existence is only *inferred* from "the perceptible changes which they produce externally, in the general state of the organism;" they are, there-

* Rau quoted by Hahnemann, p. 112.

fore, to be included among the hidden things which he tells us "it is madness to attempt to investigate."

Desperate as the case is, Dr. Black does not abandon it. A false analogy was the foundation of homoeopathy, and may surely assist the building. Hear an inductive philosopher! "If tubercles existed on the skin, would they not be ranked among the symptoms? Then why should they not also be so considered when existing in the lung, made appreciable to the physician, not by sight but by hearing?" p. 94. Need we answer this? In the one case we see them—they are perceptible to one of our senses, and may, therefore, be symptoms; in the other, we neither see them nor hear them—who ever heard a tubercle in the lungs? We hear, indeed, the change in the breathing and voice, which tubercles produce, and this, therefore, is a symptom, but it is not a structural change; it is that by which the change (tubercles) are declared outwardly; so that here we have Hahnemann's two sides of the disease; the one—the symptoms, external—perceptible to our senses: the other—the structural change, internal—hidden, "which," according to the homoeopaths, "it were madness to investigate."

But even were the internal structural changes considered as symptoms, we still doubt very much

whether they could become the subject of homoeopathic treatment. Homoeopaths are directed to employ remedies which have the power of producing symptoms similar to those of the disease. What remedies do they possess that produce tubercles, or any thing similar to them? They will tell us, that they have remedies which can produce symptoms similar to those of *consumption*; but this is not the question. Have they any medicine which can produce “a totality of symptoms,” including this particular one? If they have not, then they must treat the disease without reference to this symptom, on which all the others depend; and, therefore, we did them no injustice, when we said, that in their indications for cure, they neglected to include those structural changes, which were not immediately appreciable by the senses.

And even did the homoeopaths possess remedies capable of producing the structural changes on which the symptoms depend, they could not, *with them*, treat disease homoeopathically. “Homoeopathic cures are effected by powers not identical but analogous.” But if the remedy produce the structural change on which the symptoms depend, it must produce the symptoms also; and, therefore, producing the whole morbid phenomena, it is

a power *identical* with, not analogous to the disease.*

But this error has introduced another; for we find, "that when all the symptoms have disappeared, the disease is to be regarded as cured," p. 97. The same disease which Dr. Black has selected, in proof of his former position, will serve as an illustration of the error of this. "There are," says Dr. Latham, "cases essentially consumptive, in which the disease accomplishes its course, as it were by parts and parcels, many times apparently beginning, and many times apparently ending,"† These are precisely the cases which the homoeopathists, from the subsidence of all the symptoms, feel themselves entitled to regard as cured; and, in this way, we can account most satisfactorily for the cases of consumption, which in their report they register as cured. But the homoeopathists tell us, that they do not regard the *temporary* removal of symptoms as a cure. This is a vague sort of statement; for what security have we, that the symptoms will not return, if the cause still remain? They tell us, that the symptoms and the cause are so inseparably connected, that the cessation of the one insures that of the other. The removal of the cause will,

* To show that this is a point of more than mere speculative importance, see case in Appendix B.

† Latham, Clin. Med., p. 257.

undoubtedly, be followed by the subsidence of the symptoms which are the effect, and therefore, the allopathists direct their treatment against the former rather than the latter; but the quotation from Dr. Latham is sufficient to show, that the converse is not *necessarily* true, for a disease may still continue, although its symptoms may have temporarily disappeared. “But,” says Dr. Black, “If the entire morbid phenomena be removed—if no trace of disease exist—can we not, with truth state, that the cause, the origin of the symptoms, has also disappeared?” p. 97. Of course we can, because the “*entire* morbid phenomena” necessarily comprehends “the cause, the origin of the symptoms;” but this is something more than the removal of the *mere* symptoms; such an argument, therefore, does not affect the question at issue. Homoeopathic experience proves their error in this respect. “Hahnemann found that chronic diseases, treated homoeopathically even in the best manner, reappeared, after having been frequently seemingly cured,” p. 100. These cases, then, were regarded as cured, the symptoms were all removed, but the cause of the symptoms not having been attended to, they returned. The question, then, is one of time. What time must elapse in order to establish a *real* cure? A year? More than that! A year had elapsed in these cases of *seeming* cure, for “each *year* they returned.” What patient would be content to wait for years,

to know whether his cure was real or “seeming,” especially, as in the interval, the disease is not stationary; for in these cases Hahnemann always found it “reappear with new symptoms, AND EACH YEAR WITH A PERCEPTIBLE INCREASE OF ITS INTENSITY,” p. 109.

CHAPTER IV.

Homoeopathic Materia Medica exhibits all the imperfections charged against the Allopathic, with some additional Absurdities—System of Infinitesimal Doses—Patients killed by Homoeopathic Practice, until inappreciable doses were resorted to—Absurdity and contradiction of the Infinitesimal Dose System.

*But taking, once a week, on a knife's point,
The quantity of a grain of mustard of it ;
Become stout Marses, and beget young cupids.*

'Tis the secret,

*Of nature naturized, 'gainst all infections,
Cures all diseases coming of all causes ;
A month's grief in a day, a year's in twelve ;
And, of what age soever, in a month ;
Past all the doses of your drugging doctors.*

*I'll undertake, withal, to fright the plague
Out of the kingdom in three months.*

Sir, I'll do't. Meantime

*I'll give away so much unto my man,
Shall serve the whole city with preservative
Weekly ; each house his dose.*

ALCHEMIST.

THE branch of medicine in which the greatest innovation has been made by Homoeopathy, is that of Materia Medica, which treats of the character, preparation, selection, and application of remedial

agents ; and, accordingly, it is in this department that we find the unphilosophical character of that pretended science most fully developed, and the ridiculous absurdities in which all its adherents must profess their belief most conspicuously displayed.

Proceeding on the system which we have already exposed, the homoeopaths have unsparingly attacked the existing *Materia Medica*, and seem to have thought that little more was necessary to establish the character of theirs. It is singular, however, that so unscrupulous a defender of homoeopathy as Dr. Black, should not have been aware, that in the chapter of his book, where he explains the homoeopathic system, he has indirectly admitted, that it possesses all the defects of that which it is proposed to supersede, and that on these it has engrafted some absurdities peculiarly its own.

The great advantage to be gained by the introduction of the homoeopathic law, and the compensation offered to those who are willing to embrace all its contradictions is, that it proposes “ a simple, certain, and universal law ” for the discovery of the true (pure) action of remedies. For this purpose it was that Hahnemann “ conducted a course of experiments upon himself and friends, patiently enduring the annoyance of a

rigid regimen, and the severe suffering produced by the medicines.”*

His conscience would no longer allow him “to give actively dangerous substances in obedience only to the vague directions of books.” He abandoned medicine until the results of his experiments satisfied his conscience, and enabled him to resume his professional career. And what is the character of these experiments, as given by one of his warmest supporters? Dr. Black, in speaking of the fruit of Hahnemann’s labour, and suffering, and toil, confesses, that “he is not ignorant, that Hahnemann, commingling the symptoms of the various experimenters without noticing what doses were employed, what symptoms were primarily manifested, in what groups or order of succession they were observed by different individuals, and the slight regard paid to the objective symptoms, render it impracticable to know the organ primarily affected, the genetic relation of many individual symptoms, or, what is most important, the character, the total operation of the medicine; so that it may be viewed as a difficult task, for one who refers to these records of symptoms, to select the right remedy,”† p. 59. In page 46, Dr. Black observes, of the identical experiments which he

* Black, p 19. Russel, Brit. Journ. of Hom., p. 3.

† See note, p. 40.

has so characterised, that “the purest proofs, those best ascertained, and those to which Hahnemann and his school appeal, are the numerous experiments performed by himself and followers.”

And, how is the “ignorance” in which the homoeopathsists admit that they are left by “these purest proofs,” to be corrected in practice?

“After *years of experience* at the bed side, with the remedies this represented, homoeopathsists become *gradually* acquainted with the characters of each, its total operation with its particular tendencies,” p. 60.

So it is the homoeopathsists after all, who adopt, as “another field for experiment, the unfortunate patient,” while thus *gradually* acquainting themselves with the effects of their remedies, p. 49. But as they themselves say, “Even granting that this were merciful and proper, it still would be defective; for the class of diseases which present themselves as constantly the same, is exceedingly small; it is like judging the weight of bodies by putting them into a false balance,” p. 9. The chief difference then is this:—The allopath; having ascertained “that certain of the inferior animals are affected by almost all poisons in the same way as ourselves,”* and having fixed experimentally the slight peculiarities which exist, test each unknown substance upon them, *in doses*

* Christison on Poisons, p. 64.

capable of producing an undoubted effect; and, subsequently, still further confirm this experience by careful trials with it in disease. The homoeopaths, on the other hand, disdaining experiments on the lower animals, test their medicine on the healthy subject, and dare not, of course, give active substances in doses of acknowledged power. Hence the confusion which renders it “impracticable for them to know the character, the total operation of the medicine; and makes it a difficult task for them to select the right remedy.” It is this that drives them in their *uncertainty* “to *experiment* on the unfortunate patient,” who must, therefore, too often suffer from this confusion and ignorance.

It is customary in medicine to combine, in one prescription, several substances, none of which are capable singly of producing the effect desired,* and against this system Hahenmann indulges in three pages of ponderous sarcasm, which forcibly remind us of the fable of the ass, which tried to imitate the gambols of the lap-dog. So enamoured is Dr. Black of the freaks of the “double-head” in his playful moments, that he transfers the whole to his own work; would that our limits permitted us to do the same! Decidedly as we advocate simplicity in prescriptions, we cannot see why, for

* The modifications which these medicinal combinations are used to produce, are clearly laid down by Dr. Paris. See Appendix (C.)

example, the action of a purgative should be *necessarily* impeded by some substance given along with it, to counteract its griping effects; or that of an opiate, by a combination which obviates its constipating powers; indeed, we know that it is not.

But all the ridicule which Hahnemann employs might be turned with equal effect against his own school; for, if there be a danger in combining three medicines, producing different effects, do we escape it by prescribing one which produces *nine hundred and thirty* different symptoms? As a necessary result of the great number and conflicting character of many of the symptoms, which these (*simple!*) substances produce, we find one of them, *nux vomica*, is used in such different diseases as the following:—Chronic vomiting, headache, chronic cough, diarrhœa, constipation, piles, dyspepsia, &c., &c. Nay, as if determined to contradict every thing he ever writes, Dr. Black illustrates his principle of simple formula by such a report and prescription as the following:—

August 26.—A great deal better. Piles have almost entirely disappeared. Ant. Crud, followed by Lach, Sepia, Sulph. Nux. v". (Disp. Rep., p. 17.) *Five different substances!!* and this, notwithstanding Hahnemann has declared, that "to prescribe compound prescriptions is the height of empiricism!! We were not before aware, in what precise place in the scale the homœopathists put themselves.

Again, it is asserted, that in the allopathic method, “no one law of therapeutics is steadily acted upon,” and we are taunted with the differences that have prevailed among the practitioners of medicine; it would appear, that even the profession of a “universal law” affords no security against this, for the dose in which their remedies are to be administered “is a question, still, in a measure, sub judice, and which has given rise to many an unseemly discussion; the acrimony of which would lead us to suppose, that it was a vital point in homoeopathy, and that the selection of the dose, instead of being subordinate, was paramount in importance to that of the remedy,” p. 146.

Dr. Black laudably attempts to act as peace maker, declaring, “That where the medicine is well chosen, the difference of dilution is really very imperceptible, and the thirtieth succeeds as well as the third,” p. 146. We have no doubt it does, and think it

“Strange such difference should be,
 ‘Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.”

But it is in the system of infinitesimal doses that we find the fullest development of homoeopathic absurdities. An admirable synopsis of the views of Hahnemann on this subject, is given by Mr. Pereira, which we subjoin as the most concise statement we have met with.

The homoeopathists believe, that “The effects

of medicines do not decrease in proportion to the diminution of the dose. Thus, eight drops of a medicinal tincture do not produce four times the effect of two drops, but only twice; hence he uses, exceedingly small doses of medicines."

"Proceeding gradually in his reductions, he has brought his doses down to an exiguity before unheard of, and seemingly incredible. The millionth part of a grain of many substances is an ordinary (homoeopathic) dose; but the reduction proceeds to a billionth, a trillionth, nay to the decillionth of a grain, and the whole materia medica may be carried in the waistcoat pocket."

"The following is the method of obtaining these small doses:—Suppose the substance to be a solid; reduce it to a powder, and mix one grain of it with ninety-nine grains of sugar of milk,* this constitutes the *first attenuation*. To obtain the *second attenuation*, mix one grain of the first attenuation with a hundred grains of sugar of milk. The *third attenuation* is produced by mixing one grain of the second attenuation with ninety-nine grains of sugar of milk. In this way he proceeds until he arrives at the *thirtieth attenuation*. The following table will show the

* "The sugar of milk (*saccharum lactis*) is generally brought from Switzerland, where it is prepared by the evaporation of the whey obtained after making cheese. The purest is crystallized, hard, colourless, slightly sweet, and inodorous. Other specimens contain more or less of animal matter."—Black, p. 72.

strength of the different attenuations, with the signs he employs to distinguish them :—

<i>Signs.</i>	<i>Strength of One Grain.</i>
1. First attenuation,	. one hundredth part of a grain.
2. Second „	. one thousandth „
I. Third „	. one millionth „
II. Sixth „	. one billionth „
III. Ninth „	. one trillionth „
IV. Twelfth „	. one quadrillionth „
V. Fifteenth „	. one quintillionth „
VI. Eighteenth „	. one sextillionth „
VII. Twenty-first „	. one septillionth „
VIII. Twenty-fourth „	. one octillionth „
IX. Twenty-seventh „	. one nonillionth „
X. Thirtieth „	. one decillionth „

Here is a tabular view of the doses of some substances employed by the homoeopaths :—

Charcoal, one or two decillionths of a grain.

Camomile, two quadrillionths of a grain.

Nutmeg, two millionths of a grain.

Tartar emetic, two billionths of a grain.

Opium, two decillionths of a drop of a spirituous solution.

Arsenious acid, one or two decillionths of a grain.

Ipecacuanha, two or three millionths of a grain.

These doses are given in pills (globuli), each about the size of a poppy seed.”*

To doses of medicinal substances such as these, is the life of patients to be intrusted when suffering under severe disease !

* Pereira, *Materia Medica*, vol. i. p. 44.

Dr. Black seems quite aware, that in those who are acquainted with the powers of medicines, such a system will excite only derision, and accordingly confesses. "That the employment of minute doses in homoeopathic practice has tended much to retard its progress, and has been frequently a stumbling block to those who might, otherwise, have been inclined to examine the subject," p. 81. Nay, he even condescends to hint, "That homoeopathy and the employment of minute doses are two separate things," p. 81. So that every disciple can have his dose of homoeopathy accurately proportioned to his gullibility.

But we confidently assert, that homoeopathy *cannot be practised* if its professors are allowed to employ doses which have an *undoubted effect* on the animal economy, because, were they to give to a patient, labouring under an acute disease, any medicine which *really* had the power of producing a similar disease,* the probable consequence would be, a fearful augmentation of the symptoms, or, in a severe disease, death itself. This is no hap-hazard statement, but is deliberately given as the experience of the homoeopathists themselves.

"With large doses, patients may be treated homoeopathically, BUT THEN WE MAY FREQUENTLY

* By the admission of the homoeopathists themselves, their medicines, *when given in the small doses in which they use them*, have no power to produce *any* change in the healthy body.

EXPECT A POSITIVE INCREASE OF THE DISEASE, OR EVEN DEATH. The *experience* of such painful and dangerous aggravations, in no case necessary to cure, led Hahnemann to employ minute doses," p. 82.

That is to say, that Hahnemann practising homoeopathically with medicines, which are admitted to be capable of producing some effect on the human body, caused a "positive increase of the disease of his patients, and in some cases even death;" and, therefore, was driven to the employment of *doses, which the chosen advocates of homoeopathy admit are inert.*

Professor Döppler has reviewed the subject; and, as his conclusions are quoted by Dr. Black, we need go no farther. The learned professor attempts to show, that the "superficies of medicines is increased by trituration;" and "proceeding on the moderate assumption, that by each trituration the particles are reduced to the hundredth part of their previous size, we shall find," he says, "the surface of a medicine, originally the cube of an inch, will become at the third trituration equal to two square miles; at the fifth, to the Austrian dominions; at the sixth, to the area of Asia and Africa together; and, at the ninth, to the united superficies of the sun, the planets, and their moons;" (Black, p. 88.)

What a pity the learned Döppler did not give a physical expression to the decillionth!

Döppler concludes, “ We have said sufficient to show, that if medicines act in virtue of their mass, the doses used in homoeopathy must be quite inert; but if in proportion to their surface, they may be of tremendous potency,” (p. 88.)

If their potency be tremendous, why are they safer than ordinary doses given homoeopathically; and how was it that Hahnemann killed his patients with doses of ordinary power, and found it safe to administer *the same remedy* after he had conferred on it “ this tremendous potency ?”

But the homoeopathists, when they tell us, that “ it has been undeniably proved by the experiments of Hahnemann and the experience of his followers, that the latent power of medicine is developed by trituration and solution,” (Black, p. 306), evidently endeavour to make the public credit what they do not believe themselves, and, therefore, merit the title of impostors as well as empirics; for if they really believe that their medicines are more potent than they appear, why tell us to bear in mind,—

“ That when medicines are to act on that part of the organism which is already affected, as in homoeopathy, the doses must be proportionally small to what they would be were the medicines to act on a part which is perfectly sound, as in allopathy,” p. 83.

Their medicines acquire, says Döppler, a “ tremendous potency;” and so much “ did Hahne-

mann see the efficacy of trituration, that he warns us against exalting too much the latent virtues of medicines,"* (85). If they have then acquired this "tremendous potency," this "exaltation of latent virtue," how is it that Dr. Black admits, "that a healthy man may devour the contents of a whole pocket case of homoeopathic medicines, without feeling the least alteration;" and only announces, "that the peculiarity of these remedies is, not to operate upon the healthy, but only upon individuals whose disease bears to them a specific relation and affinity," p. 85.

Is this power also conferred on them by trituration? Or how are medicines so potent, prevented from acting on any individual, healthy or diseased?

To sum up—Döppler, the chosen advocate of the homoeopathists, gives, as the result of his investigation, "That the doses used in homoeopathy are either of tremendous potency, or quite inert;" there is no middle course. We ask them—If of tremendous potency; 1st, How are they safer than our doses of the same substance, for

* "Care must be taken not to exalt the powers of medicine too much by this means," (shaking). "A drop of Drosera, in the 30th degree of dilution, at each of which it has been shaken twenty times, endangered the life of an infant who took it for hooping-cough; whilst one to which only twelve shakes had been given at each, was sufficient, with a grain of poppy with which it was combined, to produce a prompt and easy cure."—Hahnemann, Nov. Org., p. 306.

which we claim no such power? 2d, How have such tremendous doses no sensible effect on a healthy man, when doses of the same substance, whose powers have not been so prodigiously developed, act with admitted power? 3d, If they are so "tremendously potent," why is it necessary to suppose that the body, is in disease specially susceptible to them, in order to account for their action at all, when the *same* substances, given in the *same* diseases, in doses not possessing this potency, acted so powerfully as to "augment the disease, and even, in some cases, cause death?"

It is plain, that though the homoeopaths make the assertion, they do not really believe that their medicines have any such powers, and must therefore allow their advocate to say for them, that "they must be quite inert," p. 88.

But not only does Professor Döppler, whom, in his purely scientific character, as a professor of physics, Dr. Black calls in to bear evidence in favour of the infinitesimal doses, declare against them; but Dr. Black himself, for reason will sometimes assert her supremacy in the midst of the grossest absurdities, unconsciously betrays *his real* opinion, and admits that they cannot cure disease. "Medicines," he says, "can only cure disease, in virtue of the power they possess of modifying the state of the health;" Black, p. 57. But "a healthy man may devour the contents of

a whole pocket case of homoeopathic medicines, without feeling the least alteration, because the peculiarity of these medicines is not to operate on the healthy;" Black, p. 64. The proposition stands as follows:—Medicines can only cure disease in virtue of the power they possess of modifying the state of health, the peculiarity of homoeopathic remedies is, not to operate on the healthy; therefore, they cannot cure disease.—Q. E. D.

Truly all must agree with Dr. Black, "that the attempts to account for the efficacy of small doses are incomplete," p. 39.

But even were we, for the sake of argument, to admit that the process of trituration, and the other means employed in the preparation of the homoeopathic globules, did confer on them additional powers, new obstacles would arise to oppose our reception of the system. It is evident, for example, that the medicines so prepared, must vary much in activity, and that those substances which in ordinary practice are found to act powerfully on the system, will, when exhibited homoeopathically, *if they have any effect at all*, require to be given in doses much smaller than the dilutions of substances which have no such active properties,—so that a relation should still subsist between the allopathic and the homoeopathic doses. This, however, is not the case, as the following examples will prove:—

Arsenic is given by homoeopaths in doses of one or two globules, each containing the decillionth of a grain.* The same dose is given of kali carbonicum (carbonate of potass).† The one of these substances allopathic practitioners are accustomed to exhibit in doses of one-eighth of a grain, the other in doses of from thirty to sixty grains, that is, two hundred and forty, or four hundred and eighty times stronger. Charcoal also, which, as we have before shown, can be taken safely in doses of one pound daily (5760 grains), is given in the same dose as arsenic!

Again, tartar emetic is given in doses of two globules of the sixth dilution (one millionth of a grain).‡ Carbonate of ammonia in the same dose; squills in the same dose; while allopathic practitioners find the appropriate doses of these substances to be; tartar emetic, one quarter to one-half of a grain,—Carbonate of ammonia, five to twenty grains,—Squills, one to three grains; and yet these three different substances are given in the same dose by the homoeopaths. And their whole materia medica is rich in similar illustrations.

Theoretically, the doctrine of small doses is admitted by Dr. Black to be inexplicable; practically, we fear, it must be confessed, to be inapplicable, for we find Dr. Black stating,—

* Quin, *Pharmacopœia Homoeopathica*, p. 145.

† Ibid. p. 149.

‡ Ibid. *Op. Cit.*, p. 43.

“ What dilution should be administered is a question, still in a measure, *sub judice*, and which has given rise to many an unseemly discussion, the acrimony of which would lead us to suppose, that it was a vital point in homoeopathy, and that the selection of the dose, instead of being subordinate, was paramount in importance to that of the remedy.”

“ One party have maintained, that the high dilutions, for example thirty, are the best in all cases ; another party have considered the lowest as only serviceable, and that the practice of the former was nothing better than a ‘ *medecine expectante*.’ The discrepancy of two such opposite opinions may be partly explained by the circumstance, that the former class have had generally chronic diseases to treat, the latter acute ; and also, that in a number of cases, where the medicine is well chosen, the difference of dilution is really imperceptible, and that the thirtieth succeeds as well as the third.” *

In this sentence, the whole question of the small dose system is virtually abandoned, for, if the thirtieth dilution (one decillionth) succeeds as well as the third (one millionth), it is plain that neither can have any effect at all. For what does such an assertion amount to ? An absurdity so gross that language fails to express it. It is

* Black, p. 145.

to assert, that if a medicinal substance be divided, not into nine million separate atoms, but into atoms nine million separate times; that is to say, that if the substance be divided into a million of parts, and one of these parts divided into a million again, and one of the last million divided into a million again, and so on till the process of division by a million has been repeated nine times, that one of the atoms, resulting from the last division, will cure disease as readily as the original atom before the division was practised at all. To give a faint idea of the monstrous absurdity which such a statement involves, we may add, that the proportion between the thirtieth and the third dilution, somewhat corresponds to that between a drop and 25; 834, 986; 772,486; 772,486; 772,486; 772,486; 772,486; 772,486; 772,486 hogsheads of any fluid. Equally rational would it be to assert, that a drop of wine was as potent in its influence, as 12; 917, 493; 386,243; 386,243; 386,243; 386,243; 386,243; 386,243; 386,243 pipes of the same fluid; which is to state, that one drop, divided among all the inhabitants of the globe, would produce in them as astounding an effect as if each mortal among them were to swallow, for his individual share, 30,755; 936,633; 913,062; 472,348; 298, 538; 674,729; 150,919 gallons; the population being estimated at 840 millions.

But with regard to this last illustration, the

000; 000,000 parts, so that a single grain of any substance, in the thirtieth dilution, would extend between the earth and the sun 1,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262; 626,262 separate times! We make no comment.

“ When,” says Whewell, “ our conceptions are clear and distinct, when our facts are certain and sufficiently numerous, and when the conceptions being suited to the nature of the facts, are applied to them, so as to produce an exact and universal accordance, we attain knowledge of a precise and comprehensive kind, which we may term science.”*

Does homoeopathy stand the test?

It claimed to be “ one of the positive sciences, it has been seen that even were its propositions true, this claim must be rejected; it professes universality for its curative law, stating, at the same time, that it was discovered by experience, the two claims being incompatible; it ridicules allopathy, and yet calls for its aid in a large proportion of its cases, and in all its more urgent ones; it professes to be founded on induction, and yet cannot adduce a single fact that will bear investigation, or a single inference that does not shrink from reason; it attempts to lean upon analogy, but the straggling legs, refusing to act in

* Op. Cit., vol. ii. p, 169.

concert, sprawl asunder, and the mighty incubus falls to the ground helpless, in the imbecility of its inert infinitesimal doses.

Its law it professes was discovered in accordance with the rules of the inductive philosophy, and under this its advocates seek to shelter it from all investigation. Bacon himself was not ignorant of the opportunity which his system gives for such deception, and, as if seeing the misty form of homoeopathy rising in the horizon of the future, he thus prophetically describes it,—

“ The empirical philosophy produces opinions deformed and monstrous, resting in the narrow confines and obscurity of a few experiments, whence such a philosophy appears probable, and in a manner certain to the men who daily converse with these experiments, and thereby deprave their imagination, whilst, to all others, it seems incredible and vain. We foresee, and venture to foretell, that if mankind, being admonished by us, shall at length in earnest betake themselves to experience, and lay aside sophistical doctrines; even then, through an over eager and precipitant hurry of the understanding, and the desire it has of bounding or flying to generals or first principles, there will be great danger from these narrow philosophies.”

CHAPTER V.

Homoeopathy considered as an Art—Its claim for belief must rest on the authority of the Testifier—The Homoeopathic Witnesses are deficient in all the Qualities necessary in Witnesses—They are deficient in, first, sufficient knowledge of the fact attested—Second, Disinterestedness—Third, Integrity—Fourth, Veracity.

Men like these do the truth a great deal of harm. Their knowledge does not extend to first principles, and they are always for maintaining their positions by a citation of facts. One-half of the latter are imagined; and even that which is true, is so enveloped with collateral absurdities, that when pushed, they are invariably exposed.

J. F. COOPER.

With respect to the power of authority in producing belief, a decision admitted in any subject as a full proof, must be proposed in terms in some sense intelligible, and not repugnant to the evident principles of reason, whether metaphysical, logical, or moral.

KIRWAN.

HAVING now shown, as we proposed, that the propositions of homoeopathy are neither necessary nor contingent truths, and that it has no claim to be regarded as a science, we proceed to consider the evidence adduced in its favour, and to determine whether this is sufficient to establish it as a

successful art. In this case, its propositions must, as we have already said, demand credit on the mere authority of the proposer, and depend for their value solely on his ability and integrity. The following passage expresses this so clearly, that we shall make no apology for inserting it entire :—" The strength and validity of every testimony, must bear proportion with the authority of the testifier, and the authority of the testifier is founded upon his ability and integrity: his ability in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserted; his integrity in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. In two several ways, he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one by being ignorant of the truth, and so, upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and, consequently, deliver that for truth which in itself is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithful, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so, though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us, and by each of these ways, for want either of ability or integrity in the testifier, who so grounds his assent unto any thing as a truth, upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived."*

It is, indeed, a terrible descent which homoeo-

* Bishop Pearson.

pathy thus makes! and the transition seems abrupt, from the high claim of an inductive science, to the petty pretensions of these manufacturers of pellets of sugar of milk, who now condescend to rest their science upon records of marvellous cures, possessing claims to belief, not a whit higher than the attestations put forward in support of Morrison's Pills or Rowland's Kalydor.

But let us consider whether the homoeopaths possess the ability and integrity, necessary to give effect to their testimony. "The circumstances or qualifications relative to a witness, and which constitute what is called his credibility (as the want of them in any considerable degree do his disability, are, 1st, Sufficient Knowledge of the Fact Attested. 2d, Disinterestedness. 3d, Integrity. 4th, Veracity."* Let us consider each of these in detail.

1ST, SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACT ATTESTED.—This knowledge we unhesitatingly affirm the homoeopaths cannot possess, for the following reasons:—1st, *Because the source from which they derive their knowledge, cannot furnish definite results.*—In this country, homoeopathic cases are only to be found in the published results of Dispensary practice, and no medical man would place the slightest confidence in results from such a source. The homoeopaths themselves are not

* Kirwan's Logic, vol. i. p. 233.

ignorant of this. The following is Dr. Black's opinion:—"All who are acquainted with this kind of practice (Dispensary), must be aware how very difficult it is to obtain numerical results of the issue of the cases. * * * * Besides these ordinary obstacles to definite results in all Dispensary practice, certain peculiarities of our method of treatment tend to multiply the difficulties."* Again, Dr. Drysdale candidly acknowledges, that "to furnish data by which the comparative merits of different methods of practice may be estimated, it is clear, that from want of controul over the patients, neither private nor Dispensary practice will suffice."† And what better have we to turn to? The practice of different hospitals in foreign countries is contrasted, without reference to the variety of situations or the difference of internal arrangements; the results are given on the authority of individuals altogether unknown, many of whom must be disqualified as witnesses, as we shall immediately show; nor is any indication furnished by which we are enabled to tell whether these individuals are pure homoeopaths (that is, as pure as homoeopaths can be, who, in three-fourths of their cases, desert their own doctrines), or whether they belong to "that class of individuals, who practice indiffe-

* Report of Edin. Homoeopathic Dispensary.

† British Journal of Homoeopathy, Part 1st.

rently either way.” And are we really expected to believe marvellous doctrines, on evidence respecting ambiguous facts, derived from so uncertain a source; especially when that evidence is furnished by men, who, by their own confession, were in the habit of swallowing medicines, the effect of almost every one of which was, to produce “insanity,” or “loss of memory,” or “complete absence of ideas.” *

But 2d, *The nature of the facts attested, is not such as to admit of positive evidence.*—This arises from the numerous sources of fallacy to which evidence respecting them is necessarily exposed. The facts are, that certain diseases were removed, on the patient swallowing certain substances. It is possible, that in many cases, the remedy might be swallowed, and the disease might disappear, without these facts being necessarily related together as cause and effect. There is a large proportion of diseases, which tend naturally towards a favourable termination, and which, in consequence, demand little active treatment. The same disease nominally may appear in the same patient at another time, or in other patients at the same time, presenting very different characters, and demanding a corresponding difference in treatment. “In these cases,” says Chomel, “the principal indications are founded

* See Appendix A.

on the charactor of the disease—its genus only furnishing secondary ones. This we observe in erysipelas, in bronchitis, in measles, which may present themselves under either of these forms.”*

Could we obtain an accurate history of diseases, in circumstances in which no artificial means have been employed for their treatment, we might, in some measure, overcome the ambiguity which prevails in respect to the effects attributable to medicine, and be less liable to mistake the post hoc for the propter hoc. To show to what a length of error this source of ambiguity may lead, we shall instance the following facts:—In the Medical Commentaries, there is an account given of eighty-nine cases of fever, all of which recovered by no other means than an emetic at the beginning, and great attention to cleanliness and diet in the progress of the complaint. Now, had these cases been treated homoeopathically, the result would probably have been the same, and the extraordinary powers of the homoeopathic remedies would have been vaunted of. Again, in the first and third sections of the works of Hippocrates, there are thirty-seven cases of continued fever, without local affection, recorded. The patients are particularized by name, and the symptoms, progress, and termination of the cases are clearly related. With respect to treatment,

* Pathologie, p. 621.

little or nothing was done, yet out of these thirty-seven cases, sixteen recovered. In the one statement, then, we find all the cases recovering by the unassisted efforts of nature; in the other, nearly one-half, which shows us that we are not always to expect death to follow the neglect of appropriate treatment, even in severe diseases. But, on the other hand, the mortality of the Hippocratic cases, furnishes us with a powerful argument, in favour of artificial means of relief, for it far exceeds the proportion of that, in any other statement of the results in this disease. It is no new thing for the medical practitioner to know, that there are many cases where his *active* interference is not required, and where his duty consists in watching his patient, favouring the natural happy termination of the disease, but keeping himself ready, at the same time, to meet any unfavourable symptom that may demand active treatment in its progress.* This is well illustrated in

* The natural tendency of disease, in every case, is spontaneously towards a favourable or unfavourable result—life or death. In consequence, it sometimes requires no aid from art, sometimes the employment of the most active remedies. When a disease is evidently spontaneously tending towards a prompt and certain cure, the use of active remedies is a proof, either of inexperience or of empiricism; and we must resort to those which can assist the efforts of nature. When, on the other hand, we see that nature, if abandoned to itself, would take a decidedly injurious direction, we must resort to powerful remedies, calculated to give an entirely new disposition to the animal economy.—Requin *Elements de Pathologie*, p. 245.

Of this it is unnecessary to multiply proofs, we shall only give

the case of the eruptive fevers, which all run a definite and regular course, which medicine has no power to interrupt or alter ; and, in the great majority of cases, the duty of the physician is confined to watching for, and being prepared to meet any untoward complication that may arise during their progress. In most of these cases, active treatment is not demanded, and, therefore, we are not surprised to find, that the patients do

the following additional quotation from the admirable lectures of Dr. Watson, just published :—It does not follow, because the majority of patients, under continued fever, would at length emerge into health, although no remedial measures were employed, that the disease ought, therefore, to be abandoned to what Cullen calls the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. It is not quite correct to say, with the older pathologists, that the whole disorder is merely an effort of nature, to throw off something noxious to the system, and, *therefore*, is not to be interfered with. The true view of the matter I apprehend to be, that which a toxicologist might take ; the disease is produced by a poison, of which the injurious impression upon the animal economy at length ceases, or passes off of itself in the same manner, only more slowly, as the influence of a dose of opium will spontaneously pass away. But, during the natural course of the fever, as in many other cases of poisoning, morbid processes are apt to be set up, which, if suffered to proceed unchecked, would inflict irreparable injury upon important organs, and which are fairly in the scope of remedial management. Our object must be, when the fever is once established, to conduct it to a favourable close, to obviate the tendency to death. Upon this point I agree most entirely with Pitcairn, who, being asked what he thought of a certain treatise on fevers, declared—“ I do not like fever curers. You may *guide* a fever, you cannot *cure* it. What would you think of a pilot who attempted to quell a storm ? Either position is equally absurd. In the storm, you steer the ship as well as you can, and, in a fever, you can only employ patience and judicious measures to meet the difficulties of the case.”—Watson’s Lectures, vol. ii. p. 710.

not *always* die under the hands of the homoeopaths. This, however, does not prove, that their remedies cure the disease. But, when in the progress of such an affection, complications arise, demanding active treatment, then homoeopathic remedies may be expected to fail, and the patients life to be sacrificed.

Nor have examples of this been wanting in the practice of the Homoeopathic Dispensary.* We shall conclude this branch of our subject with a quotation, which goes far to explain why neglected diseases are not invariably fatal. “ The duration and mortality of the same disease vary much with the age, sex, and previous health of the patient, and with its complications in different cases. For instance, pneumonia is much more fatal in infancy and old age, than in early adult life; and in persons previously broken down in health, than in such as are vigorous up to the moment of attack. Louis (certainly one of the most accurate observers) states, that pleurisy, attacking persons previously in good health, always, or almost always, terminates favourably; and he has never known death to result from erysipelas of the face, gastritis, or enteritis, occurring in the same circumstances. In this case, we may ascribe to our treatment a favourable result, which, in reality, is due to the fortunate age or constitution of the patient.”†

* See Appendix D.

† Lancet, ii. 107.

But, 2d, We doubt these proofs of the efficacy of homoeopathic medicines, because, even when the constitution is not sufficient to restore the patient to health, there still seems to be a natural effort on the part of the disease towards that termination, which is the least likely to be immediately fatal. Thus, in cases where homoeopathic neglect of active treatment has allowed even a formidable disease to proceed unchecked, *immediate* death is not necessarily the result. Inflammation, for example, may attack the substance of the lungs, may be met by appropriate treatment, and may be subdued; or, it may be allowed to proceed unchecked, without death immediately resulting. That part of the lung attacked becomes consolidated; the immediate symptoms disappear, and the patient recovers a certain measure of health, although he never, perhaps, altogether regains his strength. But persons who have once suffered from this disease, are very liable to its recurrence; if, then, it attacks the other lung, in such a case, what is there to carry on the function of respiration? Had the disease, on the former occasion, been altogether removed, only the part last attacked would have been disabled, but as it was not, that portion of the lung, previously consolidated, and that portion actually inflamed, are both incapacitated for the due performance of their functions, hence the blood is not arterialized, and the patient dies. This shows well, that even in

acute diseases, patients may recover under that neglect of appropriate remedies, somewhat facetiously termed “ homoeopathic *practice* ;” but how such neglect, besides preventing complete restoration of strength, exposes the patient to fearfully augmented risk in the event of a second attack.

Again, in a patient attacked with acute pleurisy, if active treatment be neglected, *immediate* death is not the necessary consequence. Effusion of serum or pus will take place in the cavity of the chest, and the patient linger, for years perhaps, consulting, it may be, different physicians, to whom the homoeopathsists will, if their neglect has caused this termination, transfer the responsibility of the death.

Three cases of pleurisy presented themselves at the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary, during the year 1841-42. Of these, two never returned, so that the probability is, that finding themselves getting worse, they consulted allopathic practitioners,* and the third, passed into the state we have described, while under homoeopathic treat-

* Every one looking at the Homoeopathic Dispensary Report, must be struck by the large number of cases which never returned, or were dismissed as irregular—in all, 126. There are many, who, though they had no objection to consult the homoeopathsists in slight affections, sent for allopathic practitioners whenever they got worse, which diminishes materially the number of their fatal cases. We could mention several instances of this kind, which have come under own observation.

ment. Fortunately for the homoeopaths, this patient, before his death, deserted their dispensary, and placed himself under the care of allopathic practitioners. After his death, a large effusion was found in the chest, *proving that the pleurisy had been allowed to go on, unchecked, by the homoeopaths.* Tubercles were also found in the lungs, which gives occasion for these gentlemen to comfort themselves with the reflection, that the man must have died at any rate.* So must we all.

3d, *Another source of fallacy arises from the influence which imagination exercises in the production and cure of disease.*—An eminent legal writer, speaking of incorrectness of testimony arising from this source, observes :—“ In the case of false evidence produced by this cause (the extraordinary work of the imagination), facts having no existence are averred seriously to exist; in the other case, facts really existing, have imagination for their cause. I speak of the class of effects which make so conspicuous a figure in the history of medicine; diseases sometimes removed or suspended, sometimes produced by the influence of belief upon the mind†—mere belief, without any ground in nature. I need only allude to animal

* See Appendix E.

† See Appendix F.

magnetism, which obtained so many partisans at one time in the capital of France, and to the metallic tractors, which had, about the same time, so much vogue in this country.”*

In our own day, admirable illustrations of this came out, in the trial of St. John Long, the noted quack; and if the homoeopathists boast of the number who seek their aid, let them be humbled when they think of his crowded levees. We extract the following passage from the Clinical Medicine of Dr. Graves :—“ I feel, however, that we shall never be able to confer on our liniment all the wonderful properties attributed to that of St. John Long. You know it has been asserted, that St. John Long’s liniment never reddened the skin, except over the exact spot where disease was situated. I was assured, by a young lady, who used this liniment, that she rubbed it all over the chest, and that it produced no discoloration of skin, except in two spots where she felt pain. She at first mentioned but one spot, which was painful; but St. John Long having applied the liniment himself, told her that she had deceived him, and that there was pain in another spot. It had other effects equally miraculous. An eminent Dublin lawyer declared, that it drew nearly a pint of water from his head, and Lord Ingestre testified, that it extracted quicksilver

* Bentham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 181.

from his brain! These, and other wonderful stories, told by persons of distinction, with a full belief in their authenticity, furnish a useful lesson to mankind, showing that gross credulity is not confined exclusively to the poor and the ignorant, but may be found among the highest classes of society. It is a singular fact also, and illustrative of the tendency which exists in human nature, to deceive and be deceived,—that notwithstanding the repeated failure, and even fatal effects of St. John Long's applications, many persons still regard his opinion as oracular, and look upon his remedies as inestimable discoveries. When I mentioned to the gentleman who brought me the bottle of liniment, that St. John Long himself died of phthisis, and brought this forward as a strong argument against the infallible efficacy of his remedies; he said, that this very circumstance was one of the most remarkable proofs of his sagacity, for St. John Long had always maintained, that the liniment was not suited to his own case, and that there was something in his constitution which neutralised its good effects; and it so happened, for when he applied the liniment to his skin, it did not produce the red spots which usually resulted from its application in other persons. In fact, such was the credulity of St. John Long's patients, that his death passed among them as the strongest proof of the infallibility of his medicines. Indeed, he is con-

sidered by many of our nobility as a sort of medical martyr, who, having sacrificed life in the accomplishment of his mission, rising from the earth let his mantle fall on the highest bidder!"—*Graves's Clin. Med.*, page 241.*

When we speak of the influence of imagination in curing certain diseases, Dr. Black affects to sneer, and asks, "Why imagination should be more excited while under the treatment of the homoeopaths—a class of men whom he has been led to look upon with suspicion, as quacks and knaves, rather than when trusting to his allopathic attendant, in whom he has confided for years?"—P. 173. Is Dr. Black not aware of the influence that mystery exercises over the faculty of imagination, and the power which it thus possesses of favouring false opinions in medicine? We recommend to his attention the following extract from the "Medical Logic" of Sir Gilbert Blane:—"It was a favourite saying of Dr. Cullen, that there are, in physic, more false facts than false theories. It is by want of due caution with regard to these, that quackery has chiefly been sustained; for those who do not belong to the profession being off their guard, from not being in the habit of observing and reflecting on the fallacy of testimony, and other sources of error, and being anxious to catch at relief, from whatever quarter,

* For additional illustrations, see Appendix G.

perhaps with minds soured by disappointment, and exquisitely sensitive to hopes and fears, however vain. These impressions are also wonderfully favoured by the operation of mystery and concealment; for, by some principle of human nature, not easily explicable, there is a peculiar interest and importance attached to whatever is secret. ‘*Il y a quelque chose singulièrement piquante dans le mystère,*’ says some French author. The credit of these remedies is also greatly enhanced, by the successful cases only being made public, for the innumerable cases in which they are used, whether openly or secretly, without the boasted good effects, still more, if with bad effects, are never reported, while those supposed to be successful, are studiously promulgated.” In Edinburgh, we can scarcely have forgotten the numerous cases of recovery from apparently serious diseases, which took place while the Irving delusion was prevalent. There are few now who regard these as the result of any supernatural agency, and yet, we have well authenticated cases, of such cures being performed, without the swallowing even of the decillionth of a grain of medicine. “The influence of imagination on our organism is such, that in many cases, the mere thought that a certain remedy ought to produce a particular effect, is enough to make the effect follow its use. A case is recorded of an individual who was salivated by the use of inert pills, which

he was led to believe contained mercury; and, of another, who was purged, after having taken a medicine, which, in his imagination, possessed this power. It is sufficient, sometimes, to overcome sleeplessness, to give the patient a pill of bread crumb, assuring him that it will make him sleep.”* Glad, indeed, should we be, if such powers could be expected always to be developed, but, unfortunately, whenever homoeopathy ceases to excite wonder, such cures will be at an end. It has always been found, that secret medicines, however successful previously, lost all power whenever their composition was made public—*arcana revelata faetent*.† The difficulty of arriving at definite results, in such an inquiry, is still further shown, by the value put upon new medicines, by those who first discover their virtues, and who can have no intention of deceiving; a value, however, which is seldom confirmed by the trials of subsequent experimenters.

4th, *Another source of deception is our liability to form a false estimate of the nature of the disease.*—A most striking example of false conclusion in therapeutics, chiefly consequent upon a wrong diagnosis, and in a disease usually very easily recognized, is given by M. Chomel. “The

* Chomel Pathologie, p. 594.

† Of this, Ward’s medicines, which are really useful, but which fell into contempt when the receipt for them was published, afford a good example.

Common Holly having been much praised as a remedy for intermittent fever, M. Chomel determined to make trial of it in the clinical wards of the Hospital La Charité. Accordingly, he requested the officers of the Bureau Central, an establishment where nearly all the patients are admitted in the Parisian Hospitals, to send him some cases of that disease—twenty-two cases were, in consequence, directed to him. After their admission, he purposely abstained from all treatment for several days, in order to assure himself of the correctness of the diagnosis, and to ascertain that the paroxysms were neither suspended nor diminished, by the altered circumstances of the patients. He found, that of the twenty-two, seven never had another paroxysm, four had paroxysms of decreasing intensity, and eight had nothing but symptomatic paroxysms, connected with slight inflammation of the mucous membranes, which yielded to simple antiphlogistic remedies: three only were fit subjects for experiment, *i. e.* had essential intermittent fever, preserving all its intensity in the three or four paroxysms following their admission. The remedy was given to these at first in the dose recommended; the quantity was then doubled, quadrupled, and octupled, without any appreciable effect. The sulphate of quinine was then given in the ordinary way, and the paroxysms were immediately stopped. If, from the day of ad-

mission, the remedy had been given to all, or even only to those who had essential intermittent fever, we would have concluded, that it had cured nineteen in twenty-two, or, at least, eleven in fourteen, and would have regarded the remaining three cases—the only ones proper to test the remedy—as exceptional ones.” *

5th, The mere enforcement of rigid dietetic rules may often produce a beneficial result, which is erroneously attributed to the infinitesimal doses.—Dr. Black does not question its importance, but states:—“ We may safely say, that a majority of the homoeopathic school do not now constantly enforce the ordinary strict regimen, but allow the moderate use of many articles which were formerly forbidden,” p. 167.

Our best commentary on this passage, is to furnish our readers with the rules given to each patient, on entering the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary; they are printed on the back of the admission ticket, and are as follows:—

RULES FOR DIET.

“ Take no tea, coffee, spirits, porter, or ale; no sour drinks, or salted meat, or fish.

“ For breakfast—take sweet milk, with bread or porridge, or cocoa.

* Lancet, 1841-2, p. 107.

“ Take no pepper or mustard at dinner.

“ Take for supper the same sort of food as was taken for breakfast.

“ Tobacco must be given up or used in great moderation.”

THE 2d REQUISITE NECESSARY IN A WITNESS IS DISINTERESTEDNESS.—“ This quality,” says our author, “ is of great extent, for it comprehends not only an exemption of all fear of loss or damage, in consequence of the testimony, and the absence of all pecuniary interest, whether of the witness or of his connections, but also of the gratifications of his or their passions, *or of those of his sect or party*, more especially in periods, when party zeal is strongly prevalent.”* So much is interest found to interfere with the integrity of testimony, that in most civilized nations, persons having an obvious interest in the issue of any cause, are legally incapacitated from giving evidence in it. Thus, by the Law of Scotland, —“ Those persons are disqualified, who have an interest in the cause, so as to be affected by the issue, and that either immediately and directly, or by plain inference; this interest may be either pecuniary, or such as affects the witness in his character and reputation.”† It is surely altogether

* Kirwan, Op. Cit., 240.

† Tait on the Law of Evidence, p. 361.

unnecessary to show, that in both these respects, the homoeopaths have a direct interest in the issue of the question ; and, therefore, according to the legal rules of evidence, they are disqualified from bearing testimony in their own cause.

3d, INTEGRITY.—In entering our protest against the reception of the evidence in favour of homoeopathy, on the ground of want of integrity on the part of the witnesses, we must guard against mistakes ; it is of integrity, in a legal rather than in a moral point of view, that we now speak, and we must make it distinctly understood, that we prefer no accusation against the moral character of these gentlemen. In the ordinary transactions of life, their conduct may be perfectly upright ; but a strange obliquity of the rational powers, rather than of the moral feelings, seems to operate in every thing connected with their favourite science. This is by no means peculiar to the homoeopaths, but is an error into which all who are devoted to any one particular theory, are exceedingly apt to fall ; and it is with no little reason, that Dr. Latham enters an express caution in reference to this source of error. “ I say, an *impartial* and *honest* mind, because it is remarkable how apt some little favourite theory is, to get early possession of the student’s imagination, rendering him dishonest (perhaps unconsciously) in the simple reception of facts. It is like some

little favourite sin in our moral nature, which taints the character of the whole man.”*

We say, then, that there is a want of integrity (using that word in the sense which we have now explained) on the part of the homoeopathists, which precludes the reception of their evidence ; for, 1st, Owing to preconceived notions, they see and report things as existing, which have no place but in their imaginations. This we state on the authority of Dr. Black himself. “ Dr. Müller, referring to the practice of the Leipsic Hospital, as bearing upon exacerbations, says :— “ It appears not a little extraordinary, that they now see nothing of these aggravations, of which, only two years previously, they were able daily to adduce several examples. The explanation of this change, he properly seeks in the *preconceived* notions of the practitioners ;” Black, p. 147.

2d, Their pellets do not always contain the small doses, which their venders profess. The Duke of Canizzaro was poisoned by a homoeopathic dose of arsenic,† which could not have been the case, had he taken only the small quantity which the homoeopathists profess to give.

3d, In the cases recorded, the practice might often all be allopathic, for, in two-thirds of their cases, homoeopathic practitioners are obliged to

* Dr. Latham’s Clin. Lectures, p. 120.

† Med. Chir. Review, 1842, p. 283.

have recourse to the old method; and there is a class of practitioners, who practice indifferently either way.

4th, If we may judge from the report of the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary, homoeopaths are in the habit of giving formidable names to slight diseases, and thus destroy all the value of their reported cases. "Clap-trap misnaming of cases," says the talented reviewer whom we have before quoted, "is a stale trick with advertising empirics, and one, which, though as little calculated as intended to mislead the *profession*, is well known to be eminently successful in gulling the *public*, and in leading the unwary to sacrifice their money and their health, at the shrine of credulity and self-conceit."* The reviewer does not, however, rest satisfied with the general charge, but brings forward a specific case to illustrate his position,† and fortunately for us, homoeopathy has been provoked to attempt a defence. It is admitted by them, that the case was doubtful—nay, it is even confessed, that there are no symptoms by which the disease under which they say their patient laboured, can be recognised in its early stages, but "that the *presumption* was in favour of the accuracy of their diagnosis." Presumption, indeed! Are doctrines

* Monthly Journal of Med. Science, No. xxvii. p. 223.

† See Appendix H.

so uncertain as those of homoeopathy, likely to be established on mere presumptive evidence?

4th, VERACITY.—On this ground also, must the homoeopathic evidence be rejected. We cannot depend on the veracity of the witnesses. Here again, we would entreat our readers not to suppose we mean to say any thing against the moral character of the homoeopathists. They probably believed what they stated, or, to use their own apology in reference to the aggravations from preconceived notions, believed they saw things which existed only in their own imaginations; (see Black, p. 146.) But, be that as it may, from whatever source the incorrectness of their report has been derived, *it has been proved to be incorrect*, and thus the homoeopathists lose all the benefit which their system might be supposed to receive, from the cases* therein reported, and their character as witnesses is thereby forever destroyed.†

* Reported cures do not influence the public now as they once did. See the following advice from Punch, to a young practitioner, as to the method of "getting up" a book:—"As easy will it be to propound a theory of treatment; because he need only render this unintelligible, to cause it to be thought great things of. In support of it, he will adduce cases, of course. For these he may draw upon his fancy; there are plenty of Joneses everywhere, and they may live in St. Giles's, or about White-chapel, up various courts, where nobody will go to inquire about them," &c.—Punch, No. 118.

† See Appendix I.

The practical bearing of these remarks, on the sources of fallacy, is well illustrated by the report of the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary, for when we come to examine the cases in which the cures are most numerous, we find that they are diseases, which, in the majority of instances, would naturally cease of themselves, even without treatment, after having lasted a definite period. Thus, what do we find the diseases to be, of which a considerable number are reported as cured? Catarrh, that is common cold—headache—inflammatory sore throat—bowel complaint—disordered stomach—slight feverish attack—mechanical injuries (the subjects of surgical, and, therefore, allopathic treatment)—scald head—rheumatism—measles—scarlet fever; the two latter of which appeared that year (1841-42), in an unusually mild form, so that, on principles already explained, they required scarcely any treatment at all. And we look in vain in their list, for any considerable number of cures of diseases, which allopathists consider as requiring active treatment. A case of croup is given in full, but we do not think the symptoms justify that name. The same remark applies, as we have already shown, to their case of inflammation of the brain, and probably the case of water in the head is equally apocryphal. One of their cases of pneumonia died, and of that reported to have recovered, time only will show how far the patient is entitled to

consider his disease really removed. Again, when we refer to these diseases which *we* experience the greatest difficulty in removing, we find no evidence to warrant us in expecting any success from homoeopathic treatment. In five cases of amaurosis, not a single cure is effected. In seventeen of deafness, one only is supposed to be cured. In chronic inflammation of the larynx, not a single cure. In neuralgia, out of seven cases, only two reported as cured, which astonishes us not a little, as, from its intermittent character, there are few remedies given for it, which do not obtain a temporary credit for its removal. Out of twelve cases of chronic cough, nine remain unaffected by the treatment employed, and this, after every art has been resorted to, to give the report plausibility — cases circumstantially reported as cured, where no amendment was experienced — slight affections magnified into formidable diseases—and, in short, to quote again the expression we formerly employed, the whole clap-trap of the advertising empiric put in force.

We have thus, we trust, made it apparent, that the evidence in favour of homoeopathic practice, being derived from sources, which, on the admission of homoeopaths themselves, cannot furnish any definite results, relating to facts exposed to numerous sources of ambiguity, and being deposed to by witnesses legally incapacitated from giving testimony on the subject, is not deserving

of further consideration. As a quaint author has well expressed it, "An exclusion put upon a lot of evidence, saves all discussion respecting the degree of weight to be allowed to it. Shut the street door in a man's face, you save the trouble of considering the degree of attention that shall be shown to him in the house."* We believe we have not acted unreasonably in doing so, and that we shall, therefore, hear no more from the homoeopaths, that it is our custom "to dispose of their cures, by denying the facts, merely because they are homoeopathic, and opposed to the ordinary mode of treatment;" Black, p. 172. Dr. Black seems quite offended, because we will not take their facts on his mere assertion. Such facts, for example, as the 930 symptoms, which the decillionth of a grain of charcoal produced; facts, which being "the purest proofs, those best ascertained," are, of course, superior to the other facts respecting the cure of disease. But,

"Did Marcus say 'twas fact? then fact it is:
No proofs so valid as a word of his."

To such facts the homoeopaths are welcome.

But to establish even *a probable* truth, evidence of the kind we have shown the homoeopaths to have adduced, is insufficient. How much more doctrines so improbable as those of homoeopathy.

* Bentham, Op. Cit. p. 2.

It is plain, that in every case where we receive facts upon testimony, "we are much influenced by their accordance with facts with which we are already acquainted. This is what, in common language, we call their probability; and statements which are probable, that is, in accordance with facts which we already know, are received upon a lower degree of evidence than those which are not in such accordance, or which, in other words, appear to us, in the present state of our knowledge, to be improbable."* And surely, homoeopathy demands the very highest proofs which the nature of evidence admits of, for what has been the result of our inquiry into it?

Assuming that the object of every science was the discovery of truth, we thought it right to commence our inquiry into homoeopathy, by defining the various kinds of truth, with the degree of belief which each is entitled to command. A few sentences were sufficient to show, that the statements of homoeopathy were not entitled to be regarded as necessary truths. We next considered it as an inductive science, and found, that that demanded of it well ascertained facts, and rigid inferences from these facts. The facts themselves, proved, on examination, too ridiculous to command attention, and the inferences from them, even had the facts been true, were

* Abercrombie on the Intellectual Powers, p. 72.

any thing but sufficiently established. Thus disappointed in their appeal to reason, the homoeopaths next sought the aid of testimony. "Every sect, as far as reason will help them, make use of it gladly, and where it fails them, they cry out, it is matter of faith and above reason."*

And what was that testimony required to prove? It was required to prove, that a system, assuming as its basis, a fact, which we have shown to be unestablished — proceeding on analogies which we have found to be dissimilar—involving contradictions which we have proved to be irreconcilable—acting in a way which its own advocates admit to be inexplicable, yet cures disease with a success next to incredible. It must prove, farther, that all this is done by an agent, which cannot be distinguished from a nonentity, seeing it is not cognizable by physical or chemical qualities, and produces no effect which can be distinctly ascertained.†

The substances are swallowed by individuals in health, without the slightest effect being produced; but, taken in disease, the most stupendous

* Locke, Human Understanding, lib. iv., ch. 18, § 2.

† The fundamental propositions on which it (homoeopathy) is based, are,—The adoption of the homoeopathic principle as the law of specifics, according to which the remedy is to be chosen; and the administration of the remedy, in doses so small, that they do not exert any physiological influence on the economy, and are, in almost all cases, destitute of sensible properties, such as colour, taste, smell, &c.—Drysdale, British Journal of Homoeopathy, p. 22.

results ensue. Tubercles disappear from the lungs, cancers from the breast, issues of blood dry up; nay, the very curse inflicted upon women is mitigated, and no longer in sorrow do they bring forth children.* What matters the palpable absurdity of the doctrine, its utter destitution of evidence, or the outrage it implies on reason!—What though the arguments against it are infinite, those adduced in its favour absolutely nothing;—what, though resting, not on one doubtful hypothesis, but on fifty—involving, not one contradiction, but five hundred—it defies the power of any calculus, invented by man, to determine the ratio of its improbability. The days are now over, when an appeal to reason is sufficient to decide a question. The mere assertion of the homoeopathists, that their remedies have cured disease is, of course, sufficient to establish all their doctrines; for do we not live in an age, when belief is taught to precede reason, conviction to anticipate proof? It was right and fitting, indeed, as there are still some minds old fashioned enough to require something more than mere confident assertion, to claim the character of a science; but once admitted into the arcana of homoeopathy, let us discard reason altogether, nay, let us speak of it as of trifling importance!—We are little in-

* See Dr. Partridge's Definition of Homoeopathy, *British Journal of Homoeopathy*, No. 1.

debted to it for support; and it is with equal truth and justice, that Hobbes has affirmed, that “when reason is against a man, a man will be against reason.” Nay, were it not impious to search too minutely into the causes of things? It was a heathen maxim,

“Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas;”

and it would seem, that we are to return again to the darkness of those ages, when reason was supposed to contend against revelation, and her voice to be silenced by a hint, that man is not omniscient. Has not Dr. Black declared, that “The efficacy of minute doses is at present an ultimate fact, and beyond that we cannot proceed. These are mysteries which we must leave to the Great Author, who intended the whole to subserve the purposes in which we alone are interested, who has wisely secured to himself the nature and control of first causes, and who has thereby restricted our inquiries to the only useful objects of knowledge, their various phenomena;” (Black, p. 90.) Why then do the homoeopathists pretend to enlist reason upon their side at all? They themselves erected the standard by which we have tried their pretensions. It was surely not too much to expect, that the only universal law of medicine, the science founded upon pure induction, should, in some one particular, derive support from reason. Why were these high claims put forward to be

afterwards abandoned? Why was this standard assumed to be now deserted? Why did the homoeopaths claim to be the founders of a science, when they now write themselves down as the mere practitioners of an art? Was it to keep up the uniformity of contradiction, the only uniformity which their system exhibits?

Views, so extraordinary as those, on which we have commented—so unassisted by reason, so destructive of all experience—ought surely to be supported by the very highest evidence of which the nature of the subject admits. Such evidence the homoeopaths attempted to procure; and it is painful to think, that it is sought for by experiments on actual disease, and that with no principles more definite than those we have analyzed, they unhesitatingly proceeded to tamper with life. Alas, poor Malibran!*

But when we come to examine these experiments, they are incapable of establishing even probable truth, much less statements so marvellous as those of homoeopathy. Whichever way we turn, on whatever side we look, we still encounter disappointment. That such a system should have its professors is not wonderful, when the credulity of man offers so tempting a bait. That such absurdities should have their admirers, will not surprise those who have studied human nature in

* For an account of the death of Madame Malibran. See *Med. Gazette*, vol. xix.

its various and more painful phases. That such a practice should boast of cures, is no novelty in the history of empiricism. The same sources of fallacy may be again and again taken advantage of, by each new adventurer in this field; and, when homoeopathy shall have passed away, it will only be to make room for some new mental epidemic—to be a new nine days' wonder, and then expire.

Of the great founder of homoeopathy we have said but little. His history is that of his predecessors, and Bacon's character of Paracelsus, slightly altered, brings him before us. "For other impostors are only falsifiers and pretenders, but this man is throughout a monster (*i. e.* a rare double-head).^{*} What Bacchanalian oracles are those which he utters in his experiments, while he is ridiculously aping Epicurus (Bacon). Blinder than fate, and more rash than chance, he is ready to avouch the absurdest falsehoods. What dreams of resemblances, correspondences, and parallels are given us, by this fantastical linker-together of imaginations. The sophists were only deserters of experience, but this man has destroyed it, and has thus endeavoured to corrupt the fountains of science and dethrone the human mind. At the

^{*} For farther information on the nature of these monsters, see the thesis of M. La Chaise, "De la Duplicite Monstreuse."

same time, so far is he from understanding, or justly representing experience, that he has added to the trouble and tediousness of experimenting. In short, he has every where, to the utmost extent, magnified the absurd pretences of empirics—countenanced such extravagancies, and encouraged others to believe them from his own assurances, being thus at once the work and servant of imposture.”

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX A.

Additional Illustrations of the Symptoms said to be produced on Homoeopaths by certain Substances.

1st, *Common Salt*, called by the homoeopaths "natrum muriaticum," is one of the remedies, which, according to Jahr, are most employed by their practitioners; and it is also one of those, which, according to the same author, have had their pathogenetic effects confirmed by clinical observation. Of the actual existence of the symptoms which it produces, there can, therefore, be no doubt among homoeopaths, for not only has it been observed to create them in a healthy person, but to remove similar symptoms, where they exist as diseases. On the pathogenetic effects of salt (those which are produced in a healthy person), most of our readers have probably experimented for themselves, and will, when they read the formidable array of symptoms which it must have *undoubtedly* produced in them, be inclined to parody the speech of M. — and exclaim—What! Have we been suffering these tortures all our lives and never known it?

We may premise, that the homoeopathic dose of this remedy is two globules, each containing the decillionth of a grain, and that its action is found to continue for forty or fifty days after the infinitesimal dose is swallowed. What then are the symptoms to which, as swallowers of salt, we must so often have been subjected?

"Palsies"—"Swelling of the glands"—"Noc-

turnal pains, suspending the respiration, and producing a sort of semilateral palsy"—“Great wasting of the body”—“Eruptions on the skin, with lancinating pain”—“Continual shivering”—“Violent pain in the head”—“Yellow colour of the skin”—“Typhoid fever, with weakness, dryness of the tongue, with great thirst”—“Melancholy sadness, with abundant weeping”—“Hatred of those from whom injuries have long ago been received”—“Irascibility, and violent rages easily provoked”—“Desire to laugh.” [The salt must surely have been Attic.] “Weakness of the memory, and excessive forgetfulness, the experimenter blunders in speaking and writing” [as all homoeopaths must ever do, when speaking or writing about their science]. “Vertigo, beating pains in the head, with stupefaction”—“Falling out of the hair, even of the beard.” [An extraordinary confirmation of this symptom is found in the popularity, which, according to recent advertisements, Circassian Cream has obtained, as a remedy for baldness. Circassia, it is well known, is entirely dependent upon Russia for salt, and since the recent hostilities, the importation of that article has been prevented; hence, from the abandonment of salt, the extraordinary growth of their hair, falsely attributed to the use of the cream; and, therefore, this application, supposed to have succeeded so well in its native regions, fails in this country, which is cursed with an abundant supply of salt.] “Inflammation of the eyes”—“Near sightedness”—“Squinting, partial blindness” (Hemiopia)—“Discharge of matter from the ears”—“Inflammation and swelling of the nose”—“Excoriation in the inside of the nose”—“Yellowness of the face”—“Ulceration of the chin”—“Swelling of the submaxillary glands”—

“Putrid inflammation of the gums”—“Spasm of the throat”—“Inflammation of the throat”—“Loss of appetite, especially for bread, and repugnance for tobacco smoke”—“Acid eructations, nausea, vomiting, and cramp in the stomach”—“Constipation, colic, and bloody flux”—“Cough, with bloody expectoration”—“Difficulty of breathing, with pulsation of the heart”—“Paralytic weakness, and weight of the arms”—“Warts upon the palms of the hands”—“Burning of the feet,” &c.

Will any one, after the perusal of this list of horrors, venture again on the use of salt? Yes, we assure them they may. Homoeopathy has not left them in this miserable condition, but has provided an antidote, and that antidote is ARSENIC!!

2d, Chamomile.—This substance is used as an aromatic bitter, and, according to Pereira, is rarely employed in powder, “on account of the inconvenient bulk of the requisite quantity.” So much for its inertness when taken by allopathists. When swallowed by homoeopaths, it produces, according to Jahr, a long catalogue of symptoms, from which we extract the following:—“Excitability of the nervous system, which becomes remarkably sensible to external impressions”—“Catalepsy, with the ‘Facies Hippocratica’”—“Epileptic convulsions, with retraction of the thumbs, and foaming of the mouth, preceded by colic, and followed by sopor”—“Intermittent fever, with nocturnal exacerbation”—“A disposition to weep, and utter lamentations, with great readiness to take offence”—“The experimenter cannot bear to be spoken to, or to be interrupted in conversation;” and yet, strange to say, manifests “taciturnity and repugnance for conversation; and appears in a state of distraction and inattention, as if plunged in medi-

tation"—“The eyes and eyelids become red and inflamed”—“The ear is so sensible, that music is insupportable”—“The parotid glands are inflamed and swollen”—“The nostrils ulcerated”—“The face attacked with erysipelas”—“The lips excoriated and ulcerated”—“The patient suffers from tooth-ache, with pain so insupportable as to drive him to despair”—“The tongue moves convulsively”—“He is tortured with excessively painful colic”—“Endures constipation and diarrhœa,” though whether they alternate or exist at once, the homoeopaths do not inform us. “There is short cough”—“Asthmatic paroxysms”—“Shooting pains in the chest”—“Pains in the kidneys”—“Convulsions in the back,” with “paralytic weakness in the arms, hands, and feet,” while the “head is twisted backwards by tetanic spasms.” Oh science, what dost thou demand of thy votaries!

3d, *Nutmeg*.—We need scarcely describe the effects of this substance when taken by ordinary individuals, but our readers will be surprised to find, that there are individuals of so susceptible a temperament, as to be unable to swallow it without enduring an accumulation of symptoms, of which the following gives but a faint idea:—“Great painful sensibility of the whole body”—“Agitation of the muscular system”—“Malignant fever, with putrid diarrhœa”—“BLOODY SWEAT”—“A constant flow of facetious ideas,” “with a strong disposition to make a fool of every thing.” (We might have suspected that this experimenter had made a fool of his master, had it not been already done to his hand.) “Idiotcy and madness”—“Roughness and cough”—“Shortness of breath”—“Contraction of the throat, as if from suffocation,” &c.

4th, Common Rhubarb, in small doses.—Rhubarb, in small doses, is believed to act as an astringent tonic; in large doses, as from a scruple to a dram, it acts mildly as an aperient. The homoeopaths find it produces “pain in the joints”—“Restlessness and disagreeable dreams at night”—“Shivering”—“Indifference”—“Inaptitude and dislike for conversation”—“Bad humour”—“Loss of appetite”—“Dyspnœa”—“Lancinating pains in the chest,” &c. &c.

Such are a few of the symptoms which the homoeopaths wish us to believe they submitted to, in trying their experiments, *and with sufficient frequency to enable them to be sure that they really were the effect of the medicines.*

We are struck, too, with the number of cases in which madness was produced (query, preceded?) by the use of the remedies. *Aconite*, “produced, as it were, weakness of the mind, with impossibility of reflecting, and a sensation, as if all the intellectual functions were performed in the præcordial regions; and this is followed by insanity and idiotcy.” The next remedy in the list, *Æthusa*, produces “mania and furor.” The next, *Agaricus*, produces “a disposition to poetise and to PROPHECY, which is followed by timid mania, or furor, with a great development of strength.” The next, *Agnus*, “produces a melancholic and hypochondriacal state, with apathy, loss of ideas, and incapacity for doing any thing.” This is followed by “excitement, alternating with self-reproach, and ending in complete sadness, and desire for death.” The next, *Alumina*, produces “sadness, a disposition to take every thing in bad part, weakness of the memory, and incapacity for following out a single idea.” The next, *Ambra*, “inconsolable

sadness, and disgust of life." The next, *Ammonium*, "loss of memory, with diminution of the intellectual powers." The next, *Ammonium Muriaticum*, "a melancholic state." The next, *Anacardium*, "a loss of moral sentiment, WITH AN IRRISISTIBLE DESIRE FOR CURSING AND SWEARING, weakness of the mind and of the memory." The next, *Angustura*, "extreme mental excitement and gaiety." The next, *Antimonium*, "mania." The next, *Argentum*, "stupidity, and a sensation of emptiness in the head." The next, *Arnica*, "absence of ideas, loss of recollection, delirium." The next, *Arsenicum*, "mania and furor." The next, *Assafoetida*, "great irribility, with mental indifference for every thing." We have just taken the first fifteen in their list of remedies, of which the symptoms are given in full by Jahr. We might have done the same with all the rest. Whatever might have been the state of mind of the experimenters, previous to undergoing the homoeopathic tortures, it is plain, that on emerging from them, their mental state must have been such as to prevent any dependence whatever, being placed upon any assertions they might choose to make.

APPENDIX B.

Case where the Homoeopaths failed to remove the Disease, from directing their attention only to the Symptoms.

A MAN applied a few months ago to a medical gentleman in town, with the following symptoms:—Emaciation, loss of appetite, a little nausea, some dyspnœa, cough with frothy expectoration, and occasional pain in his sides and under his sternum. He had also slight hectic fever. He had been a patient at the Homoeopathic Dispensary, where he had mentioned the above symptoms, and had, we suppose, been treated according to their rules for them, but without benefit. On exploring the chest, however, nothing unnatural could be discovered, and after some cross-examination, it appeared that the man had formerly suffered from tape-worm. Decoction of pomegranate was prescribed, he also (as it was possible his lungs were affected) had a stimulating liniment rubbed upon his chest. Many yards of tape-worm were discharged, and the man was getting gradually better when he ceased to attend.

Now, it is possible, from the difficulty of detecting phthisis at an early stage, that he had that disease. However, it is certain, that he had tape-worm, which was sufficient to produce these symptoms, and which, even if phthisis was present, should have been discovered and got rid of, which the homoeopaths,

directing their attention only to the symptoms, neglected to discover and remove.

This case illustrates well our argument, and is quite sufficient to show, that the homoeopathists did actually fall into the very blunder, which, *a priori*, we predicted they would. By a negative process of reasoning, the allopathic practitioner arrived at the conclusion, that the symptoms were the result of the irritation, caused by the presence of a foreign body in the intestinal canal. He exhibited a remedy directed against *that*, it was expelled, and the patient's health began to improve. But the tape-worm in this case was not cognizable directly by any of our senses. It was the hidden, and, therefore, to the homoeopathists, the unassailable side of disease. It *was* unassailed, and the homoeopathic treatment failed to benefit the patient. The allopathic practitioner inferred its existence, without having direct evidence of it, for which he is sneered at as a theorist; but surely his theory was not without use, when it enabled him to cure a disease, which had bid defiance to homoeopathic treatment.

APPENDIX C.

Modifications produced by Medicinal Combinations.

(From Paris' Pharmacologia, vol. i. p. 267.)

THE objects to be obtained, he observes, by mixing and combining medicinal substances, are the following:—

I.—*To promote the action of the basis or principal medicine.*

A. By combining together several forms or preparations of the same substance; as when we conjoin the tincture, decoction, and extract of cinchona in one formula.

B. By combining the basis with substances which are of the same nature, that is, which are individually capable of producing the same effect, but with less energy than when in combination with each other: as when we prescribe a compound of cassia pulp and manna.

C. By combining the basis with substances of a different value, and which do not exert any chemical influence upon it, but are found, by experience, to be capable of rendering the stomach, or system, or any particular organ, more susceptible of its action: as when we combine mercury with antimony and opium, to increase the activity of the former.

II.—*To correct the operation of the basis, by obviating any unpleasant effects it might be likely to occasion, and which would pervert its intended action, and defeat the objects of its exhibition.*

- A. By mechanically separating, or chemically neutralizing, the offending ingredient; as by digesting *Cetraria Islandica* in an alkaline solution, in order to remove the bitter principle, and to enable us to obtain a tasteless, but highly nutritious fecula.
- B. By adding some substance capable of guarding the stomach or system against its deleterious effects; as when we combine aromatics with drastic purgatives, to correct the griping qualities of the latter;—or opium with mercurials, to prevent the latter affecting the bowels.

III.—*To obtain the joint operation of two or more medicines.*

- A. By uniting those substances which are calculated to produce the same ultimate results, although by totally different modes of operation: as when we combine digitalis and potash to produce diuresis,—the first acting on the absorbents, the second on the secreting vessels of the kidneys.
- B. By combining medicines which have entirely different powers, and which are required to obviate different symptoms, or to answer different indications: as when we combine opium and purgatives in painter's colic,—the first to relieve the spasm, the second to evacuate the contents of the intestinal canal.

IV.—*To obtain a new and active remedy not afforded by any single substance.*

- A. By combining medicines which excite different actions in the stomach and system, in consequence of which new or modified results are produced: as when we combine opium (a narcotic) with ipecacuanha (an emetic) to obtain a sudorific compound.
- B. By combining substances which have the property of acting chemically upon each other; the result of which is, the formation of new compounds, or the decomposition of the original ingredients, and the development of their more active elements: as when solutions of acetate of lead and sulphate of zinc are mixed, to procure a solution of the acetate of zinc; and when the compound iron mixture of the Pharmacopœia is prepared.
- C. By combining substances, between which no other chemical change is induced, than a diminution, or an increase, in the solubilities of the principles, which are the repositories of their medicinal virtues: as when we combine aloes with soap, or an alkaline salt, to quicken their operation, and remove their tendency to irritate the rectum.

V.—*To afford an eligible form.*

- A. By which the efficacy of the remedy is enhanced; as in the preparation of decoctions, infusions, tinctures, &c.
- B. By which its aspect or flavour is rendered

more agreeable; as when we exhibit medicines in a pilular form, or when we exhibit them in a state of effervescence.

- C. By which it is preserved from the spontaneous decomposition to which it is liable; as when we add some spirituous tincture to an infusion.

APPENDIX D.

CASES EXHIBITING THE EFFECT OF HOMOEOPATHIC
TREATMENT.I.—*Case of Pneumonia, complicating Scarlet Fever,
ending in Death.*

ELIZABETH JOHNSTONE, aged 10, residing in Kerr Street, Stockbridge, was seized with vomiting, on Thursday, the 22d September, 1842; on the following day she felt better, but complained of some headache, and on the morning of Saturday, her body was covered with a scarlet eruption. She complained also of slight sore throat, cough, and pain in her side.

Medical aid was that day applied for, and a message sent to the Homoeopathic Dispensary. On the following day (Sunday), Dr. Black called “between sermons,” and ordered some powders, telling the friends of the child that her complaint was measles and scarlet fever, and that he would see her the following day.

During the night she became much worse, and an allopathic practitioner was sent for. On his arrival, he found the child rapidly sinking; the eruption was a well marked scarlatinal one; there was dulness on percussion over the whole lower part of the right lung, with crepitant rale in the upper. The poor child was harassed with cough and dyspnœa.

As death was rapidly approaching, this gentleman refused to interfere, and directed the friends to send

for Dr. Black. In a short time he arrived, and going up to the bed, exclaimed, "Poor thing! I did not think she was so ill." Soon after she expired.

The case was evidently one of scarlet fever, complicated with pneumonia. Homoeopathic practitioners might have watched the child through *a simple case* of the former disease, but could not furnish the active treatment demanded by the latter.

II.—*Case of Fever with Bronchitis—Death of one Child, under Homoeopathy, Recovery of the other by Ordinary Treatment.*

Mrs. G. called late one evening on a practitioner in the neighbourhood of the Homoeopathic Dispensary, and informed him that two of her children had been ill, under the care of the "French Doctors," as she termed the homoeopathists, that one was dead, and the other appeared to be dying, and entreated him to visit her.

The child was seen immediately, and found to be labouring under continued fever, with bronchitis, under which the vital energies appeared to be rapidly giving way. Another of the same family had died a short time previously, with symptoms, which were described by the mother, as "exactly similar." Remedies possessing some power were prescribed, and the child recovered.

III.—*Case of Remittent Fever, arising from disordered Bowels, unaffected by Homoeopathic Treatment; cured by one dose of Allopathic Medicine.*

Soon after the Homoeopathic Dispensary at Stockbridge was opened, the author was requested by Mrs. S. to visit her child, who was labouring under severe

febrile symptoms. The case was one of remittent fever, which, after some examination, was ascertained to depend on irritation of the bowels.

The bowels had not been opened for some days, and the mother had *entreated* the medical attendants to allow her to give a tea spoonful of castor oil, this, however, she had not been permitted to do. A purgative dose of calomel and rhubarb was administered; the bowels were opened; the febrile symptoms disappeared, and never again returned.

IV.—*Case of Fever — Extreme Exhaustion — Death threatened, from want of the use of Stimuli in the Homoeopathic Treatment of the Case.*

T. M'K. labouring under fever; was attended by the homoeopathists. This had continued for about ten days, when an allopathic practitioner was sent for. The man was found in the following state:—Pulse 120, very weak; tongue black and dry; teeth covered with sordes; incessant moaning; cold clammy sweat, confined to the face and chest; bowels costive; the skin covered with livid petechia. The patient was taking homoeopathic powders.

The case was evidently one of extreme urgency. The patient was rapidly sinking, and it was plain, to any one who knew disease, that unless the vital powers were immediately roused, death would be the consequence, and that at no distant period. Could homoeopathic globules do this? No! it was "necessary to resort to stimuli,—stimuli which cannot be afforded by homoeopathic medicine;" (Black, p. 163.) The patient was ordered wine, to be repeated at short intervals; gradually it began to tell upon the pulse, its flagging beats became stronger, the sighing ceased, the countenance improved, the tongue became moister.

An aperient was administered, which removed the offensive secretions which had been allowed to accumulate during homoeopathic attendance. The tongue became clean, the fever abated, and the patient ultimately recovered.

V.—Case of Disease of the Heart—Supervention of acute Pleuritis and Pericarditis—Inefficacy of Homoeopathic Treatment—Death.

J. B., aged 51, of temperate habits, consulted the homoeopathic practitioners about the beginning of June, 1843. He had then evident signs of organic disease of the heart. After an examination of his chest, he was informed that “he had disease of the heart, but that it would be cured.” Some powders were given, with directions to dissolve each of them in six table-spoonfuls of water, and to take a table-spoonful of the solution morning and evening.

In a week after, he again visited the dispensary, and received two powders, with directions to use them as he had done the former. Severe symptoms now came on, and he was no longer able to attend the dispensary, one of the medical attendants therefore visited him at his own house, and told him to continue the powders.

The same gentleman visited him again on the 28th of June, and repeated his former directions. On the 2d of July, the friends became alarmed, and sent for an allopathic practitioner; but it was then too late to remedy past neglect, the patient died on the 4th of July.

On opening the body, disease of the heart was found; there was also extensive evidence of *recent* inflammatory action. A thick layer of recent lymph was found covering nearly the whole of the left pleura. A similar effusion was found on the pericardium.

There was also effusion of serous fluid between the two surfaces of the pleura.

This case is a valuable and instructive one. The specious promise of the homoeopathist to remove the organic affection of the heart, at once stamps the character of the system.*

Acute inflammation supervenes, and yet no change was made in the treatment, as if the acute affection did not demand more active treatment than the chronic disease; and of this neglected acute inflammation of the pleura, the patient died.

Homoeopathy prescribes remedies, which produce, in a healthy person, symptoms similar to the symptoms of the disease for which it is prescribed.

Are the symptoms of chronic disease of the heart and acute pleuritis identical? If not, why was the remedy identical? Is it not contrary to every principle of sound reason and common sense, to employ the *same* remedy, given in the *same* doses, and repeated at the *same* intervals, against two diseases, one of which runs its course in as many weeks as the other takes years.

For this last case, of which the author possesses full notes, with a most interesting and particular account of the autopsy, he is indebted to his talented friend, Dr. David Gordon, who was the practitioner sent for two days before the fatal event. This patient was also visited by Dr. Handyside.

The other cases are given on the responsibility of the author; and of all, the names, residences, and all particulars can be given, if required.

* The homoeopathists also promise to remove corns by their medicine; their method is, however, peculiar, and reminds us of childish efforts to catch swallows, by throwing salt on their tails. Their practitioners are told to "apply tincture of arnica, *after the corn is extirpated.*"—*Jourdan's Translation of Jahr*, tom. iv., p. 562.

APPENDIX E.

Inflammation of the Pleura unchecked by Homoeopathic Treatment—An Allopathic Practitioner consulted too late—Death. From the Homoeopathic Dispensary Report.

“ THIS is the case of a patient, who was admitted about the middle of August, with symptoms of acute pleurisy. The pulse was 110; there was much pain in the side, a teasing cough, and dulness on percussion of the greater part of one side. Under the treatment, all these symptoms abated; he did not, however, recover his strength, perspired much at night, and the cough and pain did not entirely subside, although there was no longer any dulness on percussion. This led us to suspect phthisis. Having incautiously exposed himself to cold, the symptoms returned; and although mitigated, were not entirely removed by the treatment. This was about the 8th of September. He now gave up taking the medicines we prescribed, and expressed a wish to be sent to the Infirmary; instead of that, he was seen by some physicians of the New Town Dispensary. Under their care he lingered on until his death, which occurred about a week ago. Post-mortem examination disclosed a large effusion in the chest. *In the upper part of the left lung there was a tuberculous cavity, and miliary tubercles were scattered over that lung.* This showed our suspicion that the patient was consumptive to have been correct; and it

is so far satisfactory to know, that this complication is *always fatal.*”

[It is evident, that in this case the patient died of pleuritis, which was neglected by the homoeopathsists. It is not improbable, that the irritation of this disease caused the phthisis, in a constitution hereditarily predisposed. It is at all events evident, that had there been no phthisis, the patient would have died of *neglected* inflammation, which a timely application of energetic treatment might have prevented.]

APPENDIX F.

Effect of the Imagination in the Production of Disease.

THE strong power which the imagination possesses of producing disease is well known, and has often served to exercise the pen of the moralist as well as of the wit. The following case, which was lately narrated to the author by an esteemed professional friend, and which has not before been published, may not be unacceptable to our readers:—

This gentleman's house is in the immediate vicinity of a large market, and it not unfrequently happens, that the butchers, in hanging a piece of meat on the upper row of their steel hooks, have their arms lacerated by the hooks below. The patients, in such cases, are usually conveyed to this gentleman's surgery. On one occasion, the cries of a man, in violent pain, were heard, and a crowd were seen moving across the street; the door was opened, and a strong young butcher was borne in, his countenance expressive of extreme suffering, his face pale, as from loss of blood, his body bathed in that cold perspiration which agony will wring from the most iron frame.

The crowd, evidently horrified at the ghastly spectacle, still pressed anxiously forward, with that mingled feeling of curiosity and dread which such scenes never fail to produce. The patient was laid on the floor, and many a female lip was bit, as the

surgeon proceeded to uncover the wound, although a sort of fascination kept them still gazing in fearful anticipation of the dreaded sight. The attempt to remove the coat, however, was too much for the patient, and a groan, extorted by agony from him, caused a visible shudder among the spectators. The seam, therefore, was unripped, the limb exposed, when, lo! not a scratch, not a spot of blood was visible, no injury had been inflicted, the coat alone was torn, and the terrified man, having often been witness to accidents from this cause, *imagined* that he too had suffered in a similar manner.

APPENDIX G.

Effect of Imagination in Curing Disease.

THE following instances of extraordinary cures, by the influence of the imagination, are abridged from an able article on the imagination, in Rees' Cyclopædia :—

I.—*Case of Headache, Cured by Gestures.*

A celebrated artist, who gave lessons in drawing to the children of one of our princes, complained, during several days, of a severe headache, which he mentioned to M. Sigault, when they one day accidentally met, and who persuaded him, that he was initiated into the mysteries of Mesmer. Almost, immediately, by a few gestures, he removed his pain to his great astonishment. Dr. Sigault justly remarks, that it is probably, by such an impression, that the sight of the dentist removes the toothache, when the patient has gone to him for the purpose of getting his tooth pulled out.

II.—*Cases of Cure by Metallic Tractors.*

WE now state it rather as a matter of record than of information, that in the year 1798, an American, of the name of Perkins, introduced into this country a method of curing diseases by means of two small pieces of metal, which he denominated *tractors*.

Pamphlets were published, announcing the wonderful cures performed by this simple remedy; and periodical journals and newspapers teemed with evidence of the curative powers of the tractors, inso-much, that in a few months, they were the subject of general conversation, and scarcely less general use. A public establishment, called the "Perkinean Institution," was formed under their auspices, for the purpose of curing the diseases of the poor, without the expense of drugs or medical advice.

We, by no means, intend to impeach the veracity of those who attested the very extraordinary cures, performed by the application of the tractors; on the contrary, we have no doubt, that many of them were actually accomplished, at least temporarily. After what we have already stated, when treating of animal magnetism (such as the sudden cure of the artist's headache, by M. Sigault's gestures), and what we shall proceed to state respecting the effects of counterfeit tractors, it were impossible not to admit the truth and correctness of the majority of the accounts of the efficacy of Perkinism.

Drs. Haygarth and Falconer, about the end of the year 1798, when the tractors had already obtained a high reputation at Bath, even among persons of rank and understanding, tested their efficacy in the following manner:—Wooden tractors were made of the same shape, and painted to resemble the metallic. Five cases were chosen of chronic rheumatism, in the ankle, knee, wrist, and hip; one of these patients had also gouty pains. All the affected joints, except the last, were swelled, and all of them had been ill for several months. The wooden tractors were drawn over the skin, so as to touch it in the slightest manner. All the patients, except one, declared that their

pain was relieved, and three, that they were much benefitted. One felt his knee warmer, and, with great satisfaction, showed that he could walk much better; one was easier for nine hours, when the pain returned; the one who experienced no relief, had no pain, but only stiffness of the ancle. The metallic tractors were employed next day with the same, but no greater results.

Mr. Smith, of the Bristol Infirmary, first operated with two *leaden tractors*, on Tuesday, April 19, on a patient who had been some time in the Infirmary, "with a rheumatic affection of the shoulder, which rendered the arm perfectly useless. In the course of six minutes, no other effect followed the application of these pieces of lead, than a warmth upon the skin; nevertheless, the patient declared, on the following day, that he had received so much benefit, that it had enabled him to lift his hand from his knee, which he had in vain several times attempted on the Monday evening, as the whole ward had witnessed. But, although, it was thus proved, that the patent tractors possessed no specific powers independent of simple metals, he thought it advisable to lay aside the metallic points, lest the proofs should be less complete. Two pieces of wood, properly shaped and painted, were next made use of. In four minutes the man raised his hand several inches, and he had also lost the pain in his shoulder. He continued to undergo the operation daily, and with progressive good effect, for, on the 25th, he could touch the mantelpiece. On the 27th, two common iron nails, disguised with sealing-wax, were substituted for the pieces of mahogany before used. In three minutes the same patient felt something moving from his arm to his hand, and soon after he touched the board

of rules, which was suspended a foot above the mantel-piece."

III.—*Cures by the influence of Touch—Valentine Greatraks.*

THE proceedings of this pious and apparently sincere man, are very interesting, as affording a history of the power of imagination and confidence over certain disorders of the body. He was the son of an Irish gentleman, of good education and property, who died in his childhood. Disgusted with the religious and political contentions of his country in the time of Cromwell, he retired from the world, apparently in a state of melancholy derangement and bad health, which had been nearly terminated fatally. On recovering, he became one of the puritans of the day, and after having acted some time as a magistrate, he had "an impulse or strange persuasion" in his mind, which continued to present itself, whether he was in public or in private, sleeping or waking, "that God had given him the blessing of curing the king's evil." Accordingly, he commenced the practice of touching for this disease about the year 1662, which he continued for three years; at this time the ague became very epidemical, and the same impulse within him suggested, "that there was bestowed upon him the gift of curing the ague," which he also practised with success, by laying his hands on the patients. At length he found his power extended to epilepsy and paralytic disorders, &c.; but he candidly acknowledges, that many were not cured by his touch. Nevertheless, the unbounded confidence in his powers, and, consequently, the facility with which the imagination of the ignorant would be acted upon, must be manifest from the following statement, which he sent

to Mr. Boyle :—" Great multitudes, from divers places, resorted to me, so that I could have no time to follow my own occasions, nor enjoy the company of my family and friends : whereupon, I set three days in the week apart (from six in the morning till six at night), to lay my hands on all that came, and so continued for some months at home. But the multitudes which came daily were so great, that the neighbouring towns were not able to accommodate them : whereon, for the good of others, I left my home, and went to Youghall, where great multitudes resorted to me, not only of the inhabitants, but also out of England ; so that the magistrates of the town told me, that they were afraid that some of the sick people, that came out of England, might bring the infection into the place : whereon, I retired again to my house at Assane, where (as at Youghall) I observed three days, by laying my hands on all that came, whatsoever the diseases were (and many were cured, and many were not) ; so that my stable, barn, and malt-house, were filled with sick people of all diseases almost, &c." See " A Brief Account of Mr. Valentine Greatraks, and divers of the strange Cures by him lately performed. Written by himself, in a letter addressed to the Hon. Robert Boyle, Esq." London, 1723, pp. 32. This pamphlet was published originally in 1666.

We shall not extend this article by quoting the histories of cases certified by several physicians, as well as by divines and philosophers ; among whom were the names of Robert Boyle, Dr. Cudworth, Dr. Winchcot, &c. We may remark, that some of the cases of headache and rheumatism, resemble most accurately those which were cured by the spurious tractors above mentioned ; and that the hand of Greatraks can only be conceived to have operated in

the same way. The influence of the imagination was likewise obvious in several convulsive affections, in the same manner as in the women at Passy, who fell into the *crisis* before the magnetism was applied. Greatraks mentions several poor people that went from England to him, "and, amongst the rest, two that had the falling-sickness, who *no sooner saw me* than they *fell into their fits* immediately;" and he restored them, he affirms, by putting his hands upon them. (Loc. Cit. p. 34.) Nay, he tells us, that even the touch of his *glove* had driven many kinds of pains away (p. 30), and removed strange fits in women (p. 32); and that the stroking of his hand, or his glove, had, in his opinion, and that of other persons present, driven several devils, or evil spirits, out of a woman, one after the other, "every one having been like to choke her (when it came up to her throat) before it went forth." Now, this whole description contains a pretty accurate picture of an ordinary hysterical fit, with its attendant *globus*, terminating with the discharge of flatus.

IV.—*Cure of Scurvy by the influence of the Imagination.*

DURING the seige of Breda, in 1625, the garrison was afflicted with scurvy in the most dreadful degree. "When the Prince of Orange heard of their distress, and understood that the city was in danger of being delivered up by the soldiers, he wrote letters, addressed to the men, promising them the most speedy relief. These were accompanied with medicines against the scurvy, said to be of great price, but of still greater efficacy—many more were yet to be sent them. The effects of this deceit were truly astonishing. Three

small phials of medicines were given to each physician—not enough for the recovery of two patients! It was now publicly given out, that three or four drops were sufficient to impart a healing virtue to a gallon of liquor. The soldiers flocked in crowds around the physicians, every one soliciting that part might be reserved for their use.

The effect of the delusion was really astonishing, for many were quickly and perfectly recovered. Such as had not moved their limbs for a month before, were seen walking the streets, sound, straight, and whole. Many, who declared they had been rendered worse by all former remedies, recovered in a few days, to their inexpressible joy and no less general surprise, by taking what we affirmed to them to be their gracious prince's cure." *

V.—*Instances of the influence of Imagination in the Cure of Disease.*

THE following article appeared, under the title "Medical Superstitions," in No. 11 of the new series of Chambers's excellent and popular Journal. We give it without abridgement.

"Perhaps no class of superstitions exhibits human credulity and weakness in a broader light, than that connected with the history of medicine and surgery. Until within a comparatively recent period, the medical practice of our own country was little else than a tissue of superstitious beliefs and speculative conceits; and such, even at the present day, is the character of the healing art in many parts of the world. Like other general

* Lind. on Scurvy.

features in the history of mankind, these beliefs are founded upon certain principles in our nature—erring through that ignorance which progressive experience and reason are destined to dissipate. Man naturally seeks to avoid disease, from the pain which it creates, and the consequent fear of death urges him to grasp at any proffered remedy. His own anxiety, increased by that of his friends, makes him prone to believe; and credulity is a weakness ever ready to be practised upon by the selfish and designing. Thus quackery and empiricism originate. There is, however, another cause of the superstitious in medicine equally general with that already mentioned, namely,—the unknown origin of many of the maladies which assail us. The causes of external injuries are seen and known; those of internal, or constitutional disease, are obscure. In rude ages, such afflictions are regarded as judgments and the work of malignant spirits; hence charms, incantations, and divinations, are the curative means resorted to. If the patient die, it is his fate; if he survive (whether from the disease having run its course, or from the force of imagination acting upon his bodily system), the charm is considered efficacious; and what is said to have cured one, it is but reasonable to apply to thousands. Thus it is that empiricism and superstition get established, and retain their hold even long after science has taught us to laugh at their absurdity. It may, therefore, be curious, and not uninteresting, to collect a few details respecting past medical practice, and its still surviving superstitions.

“ One of the earliest and most prevalent of these beliefs was, that which attributed medical virtues to rings made of certain metals, and fabricated after a certain fashion. It was a custom in England, as early as the time of the Plantagenets, for the king, on a particular holiday,

every year, to bless *cramp-rings* at the church of Westminster, which rings were preserved by the people with the greatest care, as specifics against the disorder from which they took their name. Van Helmont, who wrote in the latter part of the seventeenth century, affirms, that he was possessed of a metal, of which, if a ring were made and worn, not only the pain attendant upon hæmorrhoids would cease, but that in twenty-four hours, whether internal or external, they would vanish altogether. This faith in metal rings is still far from being extinct, as we learn from the subjoined notice forwarded to us by a Silversmith, in an English provincial town :—

“ ‘ Some time ago, a young man of about twenty-five years of age, evidently in a bad state of health, came to my shop, wishing me to make him a strong ring out of several pieces of silver which he brought with him. By questioning him a little, I ascertained that he had been long subject to fits ; that nothing which he had hitherto tried had afforded him any relief ; and that he had been advised by a neighbour to try a charm, which she had known to be efficacious in several instances. The charm was, that he must beg seven different pieces of silver from seven different persons ; that a strong ring must be made containing a part of each of the pieces ; that the person who made it must have no other reward for his labour than the pieces which were left after the ring had been made ; that he must wear the ring upon the fore finger of the right hand, and that he might then have no further fear of a recurrence of fits. The young man also said, that the surgeon who attended him had signified his assent to the trial ! I asked him, if he could really bring himself to think that it could be of any service to him ? He replied, that when he thought of it reasonably, he must confess he did not see how it could ; but that, as he had been so tormented with the

fits, and as everything else he had tried had been of no service, he was willing to try anything, for drowning men catch at straws. I forthwith undertook to make him the ring, but on condition that he would call after he had worn it for a while, to let me know if it had been the means of conquering his mortal enemy or not.

“ ‘In about three or four months afterwards, my customer was passing the shop, when I called him in. He told me, that perhaps I might doubt what he stated, but that, nevertheless, it was perfectly true ; that from the time of putting on the ring until then, he had never once had a fit, though before that time he had had three or four in a week, and that he was rapidly recovering his health ! I was greatly amused with this confession ; for, to let you into a secret, though I must endeavour to blush in mentioning the trick—the ring, which I made, did not contain a particle of the silver which had been brought to me. The ring was made by me from the shank of an old silver spoon ; and yet the patient assured me he was cured. I did not, however, for obvious reasons, tell him of the deceit.

“ ‘ Upon reflecting on this remarkable superstition, if I may call it by that name, I have arrived at the conclusion, that the whole cause of the cure was a strong effort of the imagination. The young man forced himself to believe in the potency of the charm, and, in doing so, exerted an influence over the nervous energy, which produced the desired result. May not this species of confidence account for many alleged cures from the use of charms ?’

“ Sometimes a superstition accommodates itself to a change in the public mind, and thus endures long after its original form has ceased to be regarded. It is by no means uncommon, to meet with educated people, who wear rings, composed of zinc and copper, which are

supposed to have a favourable effect in rheumatic affections, merely because plates of these metals, with a fluid between them, are employed to form a galvanic circle. To fire off a child's pop-gun at a Flanders fortress would be quite as rational, and equally effective.

“ Besides their faith in the efficacy of metallic contact, our ancestors believed in the potency of certain stones, such as the philosopher's, the magical, the vegetable, and the angelic, to which mystical and superhuman properties were respectively attributed. These, however, were more strictly magical than medical, and so we pass them by, to glance at some of those talismans, amulets, and charms, recorded in a recent work, devoted to the subject.* Talismans, or the doctrine of signatures, had their origin from a belief, says Mr. Pettigrew,—‘ that medicinal substances bore upon their external surfaces the properties or virtues they possessed, impressed upon them by planetary influence. The connection of the properties of substances with their colour, is also an opinion of great antiquity: white was regarded as refrigerant, red as hot—cold and hot qualities were, therefore, attributed to medicines so coloured. This opinion led to serious errors in practice. Red flowers were given for disorders of the sanguiferous system, yellow ones for those of the biliary secretion, &c. We find, that in smallpox, red bed-coverings were employed, with a view of bringing the pustules to the surface of the body. The bed-furniture and hangings were very commonly of a red colour—red substances were to be looked upon by the patient. Burnt purple, pomegranate seeds, mulberries, or other red ingredients,

* On Superstitions connected with the History and Practice of Medicine and Surgery. By T. J. Pettigrew, F.R.S. Churchill, London.

were dissolved in their drink. In short, as Avicenna contended, that red bodies moved the blood, everything of a red colour was employed in these cases. John of Gaddesden, physician to Edward II., directs his patients to be wrapped up in scarlet dresses; and he says, that ‘when the son of the renowned king of England (Edward II.) lay sick of the smallpox, I took care that everything around the bed should be of a red colour; which succeeded so completely, that the prince was restored to perfect health, without the vestige of a pustule remaining.’ Wraxall, in his ‘Memoirs’ says, that the Emperor Francis I., when infected with the smallpox, was rolled up in a scarlet cloth by order of his physician, so late as 1765, when he died. Flannel dyed nine times in blue was held to be efficacious in the removal of glandular swellings.

“Amulets, in earlier times, were borne alike by rich and poor, and even in our own day, are not wholly discarded—showing how firmly superstition lays hold of the unenlightened mind. We transcribe a few of those recorded by Mr. Pettigrew:—“The elder tree, to the history of which many superstitions belong, forms a charm for a variety of diseases, but has been especially employed in epilepsy. In Blochwick’s ‘Anatomie of the Elder,’ translated and published in London, 1655, p. 52, we read of an amulet made of the elder growing on a sallow:—‘If, in the month of October, a little before the full moon, you pluck a twig of the elder, and cut the cane that is betwixt two of its knees, or knots, in nine pieces, and these pieces being bound in a piece of linen, be in a thread so hung about the neck, that they touch the spoon of the heart, or the sword-formed cartilage; and that they may stay more firmly in that place, they are to be bound thereon with a linen or silken roller, wrapt about the body, till the thread break

of itself. The thread being broken, and the roller removed, the amulet is not at all to be touched with bare hands, but it ought to be taken hold on by some instrument, and buried in a place that nobody may touch it.' Some hang a cross made of the elder and the sallow, mutually inwrapping one another, about the children's neck.

"Father Jerome Merolla de Sorrento, in his '*Voyage to Congo*,' mentions the foot of the elk as a certain remedy against epilepsy. The way to find out the foot in which this virtue lies, he says, is to 'knock the beast down, when he will immediately lift up that leg which is most efficacious to scratch his ear. Then you must be ready, with a sharp scimitar, to lop off the medicinal limb, and you shall find an infallible remedy against the falling sickness treasured up in his claws.' Among the Indians and Norwegians, and the other northern nations, the hoof of the elk is regarded as a sovereign cure for epilepsy. The person afflicted must apply it to his heart, hold it in his left hand, and rub his ear with it.

"During the severe visitation of the plague in London, amulets, composed of arsenic, were very commonly worn over the region of the heart, upon the principle that one poison would drive out or prevent the entry of another. Large quantities of arsenic were imported into London for this purpose. Dr. Henry wrote against them as 'dangerous and hurtful, if not pernicious, to those who weare them.' Quills of quicksilver were commonly worn about the neck as a preservative against the plague. The powder of toad was employed in a similar way. Pope Adrian is reported never to have been without it. The ingredients forming his amulet were dried toad, arsenic, tormentil, pearl, coral, hyacinth, smarag, and tragacanth."

“ Charms were equally prevalent with talismans and amulets, and in rural districts, the belief in their efficacy is far from being extinguished. The writer of this notice has heard charms repeated over a sick-bed, and also as preventives against disease and the machinations of witchcraft; and this within these last ten years, in the Lowland districts of Scotland. Those related by Mr. Pettigrew, in connection with ague, may be taken as sufficiently illustrative:—‘ In Skippon’s account of a “ Journey through the Low Countries,” &c., he makes mention of the lectures of Ferrarius, and his narrative of the cure of the ague of a Spanish lieutenant, by writing the words FEBRA FUGE, and cutting off a letter from the paper every day; and he observed the distemper to abate accordingly; when he cut the letter E, last of all, the ague left him. In the same year, he says, fifty more were reported to be cured in the same manner. Another charm for ague was directed to be said up the chimney by the eldest female of the family, on St. Agnus’ Eve. It ran thus:—

‘ Tremble and go!
First day shiver and burn:
Tremble and quake!
Second day shiver and learn:
Tremble and die!
Third day never return!’

“ The possibility of transplanting or transferring the ague was once commonly entertained. ‘ Mr. Douce, in some manuscript notes transmitted to Mr. Brand, says, “ it is usual with many persons about Exeter, who are affected with ague, to visit, at dead of night, the nearest cross-road five different times, and there bury a new-laid egg. The visit is paid about an hour before the cold fit is expected; and they are persuaded, that with the egg they shall bury the ague. If the experiment fail

(and the agitation it occasions may often render it successful), they attribute it to some unlucky accident that may have befallen them on the way. In the course of the walk, and in the performance of the rite, they observe the strictest silence, taking care not to speak to any one whom they may happen to meet." By breaking a salted cake of bran, and giving it to a dog when the fit comes on, the malady has been supposed to be transferred from the patient to the animal.'

"That these charms were totally useless, and could have produced no effect on the disease for the cure of which they were administered, must be evident to every educated mind. In the nature of things, such cures are impossible, unless, be it always remembered, the malady is of a nervous character, and over which the imagination is capable of exercising some control. The power which the mind exerts over the body, is too well known to be for one moment discredited; and certain diseases may yield to this influence, when the patient's imagination is sufficiently excited by belief in the potency of the talisman applied. Numberless instances of this kind of influence are on record: that given by Dr. Paris, in his '*Pharmacologia*,' as related to him by the late Mr. Coleridge, is, perhaps, the most strikingly illustrative:—'As soon as the powers of nitrous oxide were discovered, Dr. Beddoes at once concluded, that it must necessarily be a specific for paralysis; a patient was selected for the trial, and the management of it was intrusted to Sir Humphry Davy. Previous to the administration of the gas, he inserted a small pocket thermometer under the tongue of the patient, as he was accustomed to do upon such occasions, to ascertain the degree of animal temperature, with a view to future comparison. The paralytic man, wholly ignorant of

the nature of the process to which he was to submit, but deeply impressed, from the representation of Dr. Beddoes, with the certainty of its success, no sooner felt the thermometer under his tongue, than he concluded the talisman was in full operation, and, in a burst of enthusiasm, declared, that he already experienced the effect of its benign influence throughout his whole body; the opportunity was too tempting to be lost; Davy cast an intelligent glance at Coleridge, and desired his patient to renew his visit on the following day, when the same ceremony was performed, and repeated every succeeding day for a fortnight, the patient gradually improving during that period, when he was dismissed as cured, no other application having been used.' Cures effected by the imposition of royal hands, by stroking, by mesmerism, and the like, are proofs of the same principle; a principle of which the judicious physician may sometimes avail himself for his patient's sake, but which he will never exercise as an instrument for his own aggrandisement.

“Adverting, therefore, to the numerous phases which superstition in past ages has assumed, there is none which exhibits the human understanding in a more degraded light than that connected with the cure of bodily infirmities. Few, if any of these cures had a show of reason to recommend them to the cultivated mind; and even these few were so clouded with mummary and jargon, that one is apt to treat them with ridicule, believing, that more virtue was ascribed to the mode of administration than to the potency of the article prescribed. Nor did these superstitions exert their sway over the vulgar mind alone; the rich and great were equally under their influence, and indulged in them all the more that their circumstances afforded them the means. It was left for the progress of science to dissi-

pate these errors; and though the simple and uninformed, in remote districts, may still cling to some of these beliefs, and quacks and empirics be ever ready to impose on their credulity, as a nation we are now happily on the path to more rational and effective modes of procedure."

[In this last sentence, we, of course, can by no means concur.]

APPENDIX H.

Case, illustrative of the practice adopted by the Homoeopaths, of bestowing formidable names upon slight Affections, and so making an appearance of Wonderful Cures.

THIS, as well as the case in Appendix I, is taken from a clever paper on Homoeopathy, in the Monthly Journal of Medical Science, No. xxvii.

“ We will give one of their cases at full length, exactly as it is nominated in the bond, and see if it redounds to their credit, as proving either their skill in diagnosis, or knowledge of the course of disease ; yet they bring it forward as a pet case.

P, 11,—

“ V.—*Meningitis (Inflammation of the Membranes of the Brain).*

“ A. M., aged 4, a healthy-looking child, was in perfect health until the morning of the 4th of June, when he was suddenly seized with vomiting. We visited him in the afternoon, when he presented the following symptoms :—Constant nausea, with repeated vomiting ; tongue clean ; no pain or tenderness in the abdomen ; complains of great pain in the head, which is very hot, as is also all the skin ; face flushed ; pulse 130, full and hard ; breathing hurried ; no affection of the chest. *Acon.* every hour for ten hours ; then *Bell.*

“ 5th. After two doses of the *Acon.*, the skin became moister, and the vomiting ceased ; little sleep, and very disturbed ; frequent ravings during the night ; convul-

sions and startings of the limbs, as if electric sparks were passed through them; face flushed; eyes fixed and bright: rolls and buries his head constantly in the pillow; great heat of the head; complains of excessive pain in the head; pulse 110, full; breathing less hurried. Continue *Acon.*, and then *Bell.*

“ 6th. Slept much better; no raving, or starting of the limbs; skin still hot; pain of head much diminished; appearance more natural; bowels opened; pulse 100, soft. Repeat *Bell.*

“ 7th. The patient up, and playing on the floor. Our surprise at so speedy a recovery was shared by a surgeon in the H.E.I.C.S., who attended along with us, in order practically to convince himself of the efficacy of homoeopathic treatment. This case led him to a farther examination, which happily ended in conversion.” P. 11.

“ So this case proves the superior efficacy of homoeopathic treatment. Does it indeed, Master Slender? Verily, nobody can doubt your being full cousin to Justice Shallow!! It was clearly and manifestly a case of symptomatic irritation of the brain, from some improper or undigested article of food in the stomach and intestines; and had an emetic been administered when ‘*we* visited him,’ followed by a brisk cathartic, ‘the patient would have been up and playing’ on the 5th, as he recovered the moment his bowels were opened. So here were two days of suffering due to homoeopathic trifling!”

“ We presume, that our readers are now sufficiently satisfied as to the kind of statistics now furnished, and to be expected in future, from Drs. Russell and Black; many other cases—of phthisis for example—are cited in the Report, as instances of certain diseases, to which, from the symptoms described, they evidently bore but

a slender resemblance. Clap-trap misnaming of cases is a stale trick with advertising empirics, and one which, though as little calculated as intended to mislead *the profession*, is well known to be eminently successful in gulling the *public*, and in leading the unwary to sacrifice their money and their health at the shrine of credulity and self-conceit."—*From the Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, No. xxvii.

It is but fair to give the reply of the homoeopathists, with the rejoinder of the reviewer. Here they are,

"The *third* point to which our remarks relate, is the case of *meningitis* quoted and commented on. The reviewer asserts, that the case was not one of meningitis, but 'clearly and manifestly one of symptomatic irritation of the brain, from some improper or undigested article of food in the stomach and intestines, and had an emetic been administered when "we visited him," followed by a brisk cathartic, the patient would have been up and playing on the 5th, as he recovered the moment the bowels were opened.' Now, Sir, it is very well known to you, that, in its early stages, meningitis presents no pathognomonic signs, and, in our opinion, the symptoms described fully warranted us in treating the case as one of meningitis. The patient got no 'emetic,' and no 'cathartic,' yet he recovered; and his recovery cannot be ascribed to the opening of his bowels, for he was better in every respect on the 5th, before that occurred. From these facts it is evident, that the presumption is in favour both of the accuracy of our diagnosis, and the efficacy of the treatment employed. It is obvious, that considerable difficulty must always attend the preparation of a detailed Report from such an institution as our Dispensary. We have ventured to publish fifty cases, in which the symptoms are fully stated, and we could hardly have expected, that

among so many, in only one single instance should the diagnosis be deemed erroneous. We have given, and now repeat, a free invitation to all our professional brethren, to visit the Dispensary, examine the patients, and satisfy themselves on all points."

The following are the reviewer's comments:—

"It is granted, then, that this wonderful case of '*meningitis* (inflammation of the membranes of the brain),' might, after all, be misnamed; and as an excuse for this, we are told, that 'in its early stages, this disease presents no pathognomic signs.' Pray, why, then, does it figure in 'the Report' as *meningitis*? The case was, obviously, one of symptomatic irritation of the brain, from indigestion; as was sufficiently proved by the patient being up and playing whenever his bowels were moved. Nature wrought the cure. We refer to the case as quoted, in full, at p. 223 of last Number.

"As to the 'fifty cases in which the symptoms are fully stated,' we assert that there are very few of them indeed, in which *any diagnostic signs are given*. We had marked, at least, twenty cases as equally in point as that of *meningitis*, and as illustrations of *misnaming*; we actually referred to some of them in our review, yet we are unblushingly told, that in this one single instance have we impugned the diagnosis. We also did so in Heslop's case."—*From the Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, No. xxviii.

APPENDIX I.

Case, strongly illustrative of the loose manner in which the Homoeopathic Cases are Reported, and showing how little reliance is to be placed on the published Cures of the Homoeopaths.

“ WE are unwilling to weary our readers, but we must go on yet a little farther with our exposure of this pamphlet (Homoeopathic Dispensary Report); which, from what has been already said, and especially from the following case, appears to be too boldly styled a ‘REPORT.’

“ *Disease of the Wrist Joint.*—W. H., aged 53, a healthy-looking man, applied at the Dispensary on February 18th. He states, that the affection of the wrist commenced two years ago, but can assign no cause for it. He applied to an eminent surgeon, who blistered the part at least twenty times, but with no benefit. After this he entered the Edinburgh Infirmary, which he left in August 1841, after having been sixteen weeks under treatment; but the disease increased instead of getting better. The treatment pursued in the hospital, was, application of mercurial ointment, from which he was salivated; then poultices and stimulating washes, together ‘with a dose of salts when he chose to take it.’ These means having failed, he was recommended to go to the country; but the disease got no better. He then returned to the hospital, when

amputation was advised as the only means. This he refused to submit to, and left. He was recommended by a gentleman, to whom he showed the arm, to apply at this Dispensary. The right wrist presented, as he himself described it, the appearance of a ‘boiled turnip;’ much swollen, with the cellular tissue around hardened. There are two sinuses, which communicate with the joint, the one opening anteriorly, the other posteriorly. From these there is a copious yellow discharge. Unable to move the wrist, or flex the fingers; any attempt to do so attended with pain. He got *Sil.* 2 doses; and on the 28th Feb., *Phosph.*

“On March the 1st, the hardness round the joint is beginning to diminish, and the joint becoming more flexible. *Sil.*

“7th.—*Assaf.*

“12th.—The posterior opening has healed; from the anterior a small piece of bone has come away; the swelling much diminished, and the joints more flexible.

“16th.—Increased discharge from the anterior opening. *Hepar S.*

“19th.—Discharge diminished; the wrist presents a much more natural appearance; the pain on motion is much less; and the flexibility increasing. *Assaf.*

“25th.—No pain in the joint; is able now to use it a little; can even lift a bucket of water. *Sil.*

“He thus continued to improve under the use of *Sulph. Sil. Hep. S.*; and on the 19th July it was pronounced cured. The man went to the harvest; and up to this date, the 17th November, has continued well, engaging daily in his occupations.”

“From the reference made to the ‘eminent surgeon’ and the Royal Infirmary, this narrative was, by some acquainted with that institution, referred to William Heslop, residing in 28 Jamaica Street, who had been

treated, both in and out of the institution, by Dr. Duncan. We resolved to institute a thorough investigation into the case, as various versions of it were in circulation. We called upon W. Heslop, along with Drs. Duncan and Douglas Maclagan, and after examining the wrist, and hearing the story of the man, we were quite satisfied that the case, as given in the Report, was a tissue of the most reckless mis-statements, being in many minor, and in all essential points, at variance with truth. We do not say that Drs. Russell and Black have *intentionally* given a false account of this, or any other case, — perhaps they dreamed that the man was cured and went to the harvest,—but without presuming to read the intentions of fallible men, we state the naked truth, *that the wrist is not yet cured, and that the man never went to the harvest, just because it was not cured.*

“ Perhaps we have said enough of this case, in thus establishing its falsity in essentials ; but it may be well, before leaving it, to state the *whole truth* regarding it. The man has been constantly, for the last four years, under Dr. Duncan’s observation, who informs us—and his statement is exactly that of the patient himself—that during that period his disease has experienced various remissions and exacerbations, — the former taking place sometimes spontaneously, and at other times apparently from the treatment resorted to. The disease appeared first in the palmar fibrous tissue, and afterwards extended upwards to the wrist, involving the bones. The case now goes on as formerly. At intervals, abscesses form, assuming, for a time, an alarming appearance ; but after a time, the wrist returns to its former state. This state of matters will probably go on for some time to come ; when possibly, at last, the dead bone will be thrown off, and nature will effect

a cure by ankylosis. What a pity that such a spontaneous cure—so probable a termination to the case—did not take place when the man was under treatment by the Stockbridge apostles of the star of truth; and then, with some plausibility, though with no honesty, they might have blazoned forth the happy event as due to their infinitesimal doses.

“The previous treatment of the patient as reported is substantially incorrect; at all events, we could not gather, either from the narrative of the man, or from Dr. Duncan, that mercury was ever prescribed or used, so as to produce a salivation. As to the statement within inverted commas, intended as a slur at the medical management of a great and noble public charity, we ask, Who of all the physicians and surgeons of that institution ever consigned salts, or any other medicine, to a patient, ‘to take it when he chose?’ We are intimately acquainted with the system which obtains in that institution as to the prescribing and administering of remedies, and we do not believe that the story of the salts is true. Then, again, we ask, Who advised amputation? Dr. Duncan assures us that *he* never did. In reply to a question put by us, the man said, that the sole cause of his leaving the hospital, was domestic affliction at home. So much for the terror inspired by threatened amputation. Once more we ask, Who informed the homoeopathic physicians that there were two sinuses communicating with the joint? As they never probed one or other, it must have been ‘the star of truth.’ If so, we advise them, in future, to rely on the evidence of their senses, rather than on the revelations of ‘the star.’ The anterior opening only communicated with the joint. Dr. Duncan states, that from time to time, various openings formed, all of which, after a time closed, excepting the one which

communicated with the diseased bone. Long before the 17th November, the man had lost all hope of relief from the homoeopathists; and on that date the wrist was not examined by them, as one would suppose it had been, from reading the passage quoted above. As we already stated, *the man is till this day uncured*—the wrist is stiff—the sinus discharges, and leads to the bone,—in fact, the case is not, and never was cured. This vaunted cure of disease of the wrist-joint, so *circumstantially* narrated, turns out, then, to be a mere fiction—a day-dream,—but one, alas! having, like other dreams, an unsubstantial basis. The other ‘cases’ are, we doubt not, equally indebted to the imagination of the ingenious authors.”

The following is the confession of Drs. Russell and Black:—

“The next case referred to in the review, is that of ‘*Disease of the wrist-joint*,’ quoted at p. 224. We have no wish to disguise or conceal any thing in regard to the cases treated at the dispensary, and we shall state, with perfect candour, what in point of fact took place in reference to this case, and on what ground it was entered as ‘*cured*’ in the Report. It is needless to repeat what was the state of the patient when first seen by us. The symptoms were correctly stated in the Report. It was, of course, on the authority of the patient himself, that threatened amputation was given as the cause of his leaving the hospital. The statement of his having been salivated, was derived from the same authority. The patient continued to attend the dispensary from the 18th of February till the 19th of July. During this time there was a gradual improvement. The swelling decreased, the discharge diminished, the pain abated, the joint became more flexible,

till he was able, on his own statement to us, to use his hand in raising a pail of water, and he was heard frequently to boast of his recovery. The amendment went on, until, when seen on the 19th of July, both the sinuses were healed over, and the patient asked, and obtained leave to go to the harvest. He did not return to the dispensary, and was not again seen by us. But wishing to know how he had been during the time of his absence, and what the state of his wrist was, before publishing the case, we desired the porter of the dispensary, in November, to tell him to come and show himself. The porter did so, and was answered, that *being at his work*, Heslop was unable to attend at the dispensary hours. The porter was sent a second time, and Heslop came one day to the dispensary (not during the hours of our attendance), and said to the porter, in the hearing of his wife), that ‘if it was about his hand, Dr. Black wanted to see him, there was no use, as that was quite well.’ Upon this statement, along with our previous knowledge of the case, it was entered as cured in the Report; for, of course, like all other practitioners, when we apply remedies which we deem appropriate, and recovery ensues, we ascribe that recovery, in some measure at least, to the beneficial effects of the remedies. We may have been incautious in so entering it, but we put it to the good feeling and sense of justice of every honest mind, whether the facts we have stated (and their truth may be attested by the oath of creditable witnesses), afford any ground, whatever, for the very grave charges which have been founded on the case in question; and we put it to the candour of the public officers of any such institution as our dispensary, whether similar statements of cases, upon similar grounds, do not occasionally find their

way into their records; and we conceive, that we congratulate ourselves on the accuracy of our Report, if these are the only two cases which so keen and unscrupulous an opponent as the reviewer is able to turn against us. We feel confident, that no candid examiner will be of opinion, that the reviewer is justified in charging us with stating ‘fictions,’ and ‘making reckless mis-statements, in all essential points at variance with truth.’ We cannot, indeed, hope that this explanation will satisfy those who are willing to believe us capable of deliberately stating an untruth. From the fairness or candour of such persons we have nothing to expect, but we fully anticipate, that this explanation will be satisfactory to all whose judgment is not warped by prejudice or enmity.”

On which the reviewer comments as follows:—

“ We visited, along with Drs. Duncan and D. Mac-lagan, William Heslop, the man alleged to be so wonderfully cured, after an ‘eminent surgeon,’ and the collective skill of the Royal Infirmary, had signally failed. We found, in the first place, that the man was not cured. We found that Drs. Black and Russell had not examined the sinus with a probe, and were, therefore, not aware that it led to a diseased bone. We found, also, that the man’s having gone to the harvest was as fabulous as his having been cured. Many of the minor details we discovered to be equally erroneous. We most distinctly said, at p. 224, that we did not accuse ‘Drs. Russell and Black of *intentionally* giving a false account of this or any other case;’ but, at the same time, *the account being false*, we were justified, nay, bound, as honest journalists, to state, that ‘we called upon W. Heslop, along with Drs. Duncan and Douglas Maclagan, and, after examining the wrist, and

hearing the story of the man, we were quite satisfied that the case, as given in the Report, was a tissue of the most reckless mis-statements, being, in many minor, and in all essential points, at variance with truth.' It would be curious to know, in how many cases the dispensary porter was the reporter of the cures!"

FINIS.